1 2 3	STATE OF NEW MEXICO ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS OFFICE TAX ADMINISTRATION ACT
4	TUCKER MIDSTREAM, INC.
5	v. AHO No. 23.08-037A, D&O No. 23-17
6	NEW MEXICO TAXATION AND REVENUE DEPARTMENT
7	DECISION AND ORDER
8	On November 17, 2023, Hearing Officer Dee Dee Hoxie, Esq. conducted a
9	videoconference hearing on the merits of the protest to the assessment. The Taxation and
10	Revenue Department (Department) was represented by Timothy Williams, Staff Attorney. Mitchell
11	Bartholomew, Auditor, was also present for the Department. Tucker Midstream, Inc. (Taxpayer)
12	was represented by Jake Adkins and William Bader of Merits Advisors. Mr. Bartholomew
13	testified. The Hearing Officer took notice of all documents in the administrative file. The
14	Department's exhibits A through G (screenshots of website) were admitted.
15	The main issue to be decided is whether the Taxpayer owes penalty and interest. The
16	Hearing Officer considered all of the evidence and arguments presented by both parties.
17	Because the Taxpayer's payment of the tax was late and there was no evidence that the Taxpayer
18	was not negligent, the Hearing Officer finds in favor of the Department. IT IS DECIDED AND
19	ORDERED AS FOLLOWS:
20	FINDINGS OF FACT
01	1 Or Ordeland 17, 2022 the Decoder of Second and Second data the Terror The
21	1. On October 17, 2022, the Department issued an assessment to the Taxpayer. The
22	assessment was for the tax period ending August 31, 2022. The Taxpayer was assessed for gross

Tucker Midstream, Inc. Case No. 23.08-037A page 1 of 6 receipts tax of \$69,532.56, penalty of \$1,390.65, and interest of \$163.83, for a total liability of
 \$71,087.04. [Admin. file L0430147696; Testimony¹].

3 2. On November 30, 2022, the Taxpayer filed a timely written protest by email.
4 [Admin. file protest].

5 3. On February 28, 2023, the Department acknowledged its receipt of the protest.
6 [Admin. file].

7 4. On August 29, 2023, the Department filed a request for hearing and answer to the
8 protest with the Administrative Hearings Office. [Admin. file request].

9 5. On October 6, 2023, a telephonic scheduling hearing was conducted, which was
10 within 90 days of the request as required by statute. [Admin. file].

11 6. T

6. The Taxpayer files monthly gross receipts tax. [Testimony].

7. For the tax period ending August 31, 2022², the Taxpayer's gross receipts tax
payment and return were due on September 25, 2022. [Testimony].

8. The Taxpayer filed a gross receipts tax return on September 19, 2022.

15 [Testimony; Exhibits C through G].

9. The Taxpayer failed to make its gross receipts tax payment when it filed its return
and failed to make its payment by the September 25th due date. [Testimony; Exhibits A through
G].

19

20

14

10. The Taxpayer was assessed for the unpaid gross receipts tax, penalty, and interest on October 17, 2022. [L0430147696].

¹ All references to testimony mean the testimony given by Mr. Bartholomew as he was the only witness who testified at the hearing.

² All references to the Taxpayer's return or payment relate to this tax period.

1 11. The Taxpayer paid the assessed gross receipts tax on November 8, 2022, but it did
 2 not pay the penalty or interest. [Testimony; Exhibits A and B].

3 12. Since the Taxpayer's payment was made more than 10 days after the assessment,
4 additional penalty and interest accrued. [Testimony; L0430147696].

5 13. The penalty due is \$2,781.30, and the interest due is \$483.87. Therefore, the
6 Taxpayer's total current liability under the assessment is \$3,265.17. [Testimony].

DISCUSSION

Burden of proof.

9 "The taxpayer shall have the burden of proof, except as otherwise provided by law." 10 22.600.3.24 (B) NMAC (2020). Assessments by the Department are presumed to be correct. See 11 NMSA 1978, § 7-1-17 (2007). See El Centro Villa Nursing Ctr. v. Taxation and Revenue 12 Department, 1989-NMCA-070, 108 N.M. 795. See also Archuleta v. O'Cheskey, 1972-NMCA-13 165, ¶11, 84 N.M. 428. See also N.M. Taxation & Revenue Dep't v. Casias Trucking, 2014-14 NMCA-099, ¶8. The presumption extends to the assessment of penalty and interest. See 3.1.6.13 15 NMAC (2001). "The effect of the presumption of correctness is that the taxpayer has the burden of 16 coming forward with some countervailing evidence tending to dispute the *factual correctness* of the 17 assessment". 3.1.6.12 (A) NMAC (2001) (emphasis added). See Gemini Las Colinas, LLC v. N.M. 18 Taxation & Revenue Dep't, 2023-NMCA-039. See also 22.600.1.18 and 22.600.3.24 NMAC.

19

7

8

Assessment of penalty and interest.

The Taxpayer presented no evidence and conceded on the facts. The Taxpayer was required
to pay the tax and file the return on September 25, 2022. The Taxpayer's return was filed before the
deadline, but the tax was paid late. In its written protest, the Taxpayer indicates that the failure to

Tucker Midstream, Inc. Case No. 23.08-037A page 3 of 6 pay the tax at the time that the return was filed was an inadvertent error. The Taxpayer requested a
 waiver of penalty.

3 When a tax is not paid by the due date or a return is not filed by its due date, "there shall 4 be added to the amount assessed a penalty". NMSA 1978, § 7-1-69 (A) (2021) (emphasis 5 added). Interest "shall be paid" on taxes that were not paid on or before the date on which they 6 were due. NMSA 1978, § 7-1-67 (A) (2013). The word "shall" indicates that the assessments of 7 penalty and interest are mandatory, not discretionary. See Marbob Energy Corp. v. N.M. Oil 8 Conservation Comm'n., 2009-NMSC-013, ¶ 22, 146 N.M. 24. Penalty is added based on the 9 greater of the amount of tax due but unpaid or on the amount of tax liability established in the 10 late-filed return, calculated by multiplying the appropriate amount by "two percent per month or 11 any fraction of a month" from the due date. NMSA 1978, § 7-1-69 (A) (1) and (A) (2).

Interest only accrues when tax is owed but not paid on the due date, and it accrues only
until the tax is paid. *See* NMSA 1978, § 7-1-67. There is no provision for excusing interest. *See*NMSA 1978, § 7-1-67. *See also* 3.1.10.18 NMAC (2001).

If a taxpayer is not negligent, penalty may be excused. *See* 3.1.11.11 NMAC (2001)
(listing several factors, such as consulting an accountant, that indicate non-negligence). The
Taxpayer presented no evidence at the hearing, and the written protest admits that the failure to
pay the tax when it was due was an unintentional mistake. Negligence includes "inadvertence,
indifference, thoughtlessness, carelessness, erroneous belief or inattention." 3.1.11.10 NMCA
(2001). The Taxpayer's failure to pay the tax when it was due was negligent. *See id. See also Tiffany Const. Co., Inc. v. Bureau of Revenue*, 1976-NMCA-127, 90 N.M. 16.

Tucker Midstream, Inc. Case No. 23.08-037A page 4 of 6

1	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
2	A. The Taxpayer filed a timely written protest of the Department's assessment, and
3	jurisdiction lies over the parties and the subject matter of this protest. See NMSA 1978, § 7-1B-8
4	(2019).
5	B. The first hearing was timely set and held within 90 days of the request for hearing.
6	See id. See also 22.600.3.8 NMAC (2020).
7	C. Because the Taxpayer paid the tax late, penalty and interest were owed. <i>See</i> NMSA
8	1978, § 7-1-67 and § 7-1-69.
9	D. The Taxpayer failed to prove that it was not negligent. Consequently, the penalty
10	was applied appropriately. See 7-1-69. See also 3.1.11.10 NMCA and 3.1.11.11 NMCA.
11	For the foregoing reasons, the Taxpayer's protest IS DENIED . IT IS ORDERED that
12	Taxpayer is liable for \$2,781.30 in penalty and \$483.87 in interest for a total outstanding liability
13	of \$3,265.17.
14	DATED: December 7, 2023.
15	Dee Dee House
16	Dee Dee Hoxie
17 18	Hearing Officer Administrative Hearings Office
10 19	P.O. Box 6400
20	Santa Fe, NM 87502
21	NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL
22	Pursuant to NMSA 1978, Section 7-1-25 (2015), the parties have the right to appeal this
23	decision by filing a notice of appeal with the New Mexico Court of Appeals within 30 days of the
24	date shown above. If an appeal is not timely filed with the Court of Appeals within 30 days, this

1 Decision and Order will become final. Rule of Appellate Procedure 12-601 NMRA articulates 2 the requirements of perfecting an appeal of an administrative decision with the Court of Appeals. 3 Either party filing an appeal shall file a courtesy copy of the appeal with the Administrative 4 Hearings Office contemporaneous with the Court of Appeals filing so that the Administrative 5 Hearings Office may begin preparing the record proper. The parties will each be provided with a 6 copy of the record proper at the time of the filing of the record proper with the Court of Appeals, 7 which occurs within 14 days of the Administrative Hearings Office receipt of the docketing 8 statement from the appealing party. See Rule 12-209 NMRA.

9

10

11

12

13 14

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

On December 7, 2023, a copy of the foregoing Decision and Order was submitted to the parties listed below in the following manner:

First Class Mail and Email

First Class Mail and Email

INTENTIONALLY BLANK