1	CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION				
2	SUMMARY DECISION UNDER REVENUE AND TAXATION CODE SECTION 40				
3					
4 5	In the Matter of the Petition for Redetermination and Claim for Refund Under the Sales and Use Tax Law of:	Case ID 5564	SR Z OHA 97-183225		
6	SMF ENERGY CORPORATION		556419, 557544 November 19, 2013		
7	Petitioner/Claimant)			
8					
9	Representing the Parties:				
10	For Petitioner:	No Appearance			
11	For Sales and Use Tax Department:	Andrew Kwee, Tax C	Counsel		
12	For Appeals Division:	Jeffrey G. Angeja, Tax Counsel IV			
13	LEGAL ISSUE				
14	Whether a portion of the selling price charged for fuel represents a fee charged by petitioner for				
15	nontaxable transportation services.				
16	FINDINGS OF FACT AND RELATED CONTENTIONS				
17	Petitioner operated a mobile and bulk fueling service throughout the United States. It did not				
18	maintain any underground storage tanks; instead it purchased fuel on a daily basis and delivered the				
19	fuel to its customers. During its audit of the period April 1, 2005, through March 31, 2008, the Sales				
20	and Use Tax Department (Department) found that petitioner's reported gross receipts were less than				
21	the amount shown for sales of fuel in its records. Upon further review, the Department found				
22	petitioner regarded a portion of the amount shown on the invoice as the sale price of fuel as a				
23	nontaxable service charge. ¹ The Department concluded that the difference between the selling price				
24	shown on the invoice and the amount reported to the	e Board represented tra	ansportation charges, which		
25					
26					
27	¹ For example, with respect to the only invoice copied in the a issue, the amount charged for a sale of diesel was \$1,696.04.	However, for that sale, the			

-1-

STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION SALES AND USE TAX APPEAL were subject to tax because they were not separately stated on the sales invoice. Petitioner disputes
that conclusion, arguing that the difference represents a fee for outsourced logistical services, such as
data collection, reporting, and truck-to-truck redistribution of fuel, which petitioner regards as
nontaxable services. In addition, petitioner has filed a claim for refund of the tax that it reported on
returns with respect to the alleged logistical services fee for the period December 15, 2006, through
October 31, 2010. The claim for refund, which is timely for the period October 1, 2007, through
October 31, 2010, is based on the same grounds as the above-described petition.

8 APPLICABLE LAW

A sale or purchase includes any transfer of title or possession, in any manner or by any means whatsoever, of tangible personal property for consideration. (Rev. & Tax. Code, §§ 6006, subd. (a), 6010, subd. (a).) Taxable gross receipts or sales price includes all amounts received with respect to the sale, with no deduction for the cost of the materials used, labor or service cost, or other expenses of the retailer passed on to the purchaser unless there is a specific statutory exemption or exclusion. (Rev. & Tax. Code, §§ 6011, subd. (a), 6012, subd (a).) Such terms include any services that are a part of the sale. (Rev. & Tax. Code, § 6012, subd. (b)(1).)

Taxable gross receipts also include the cost of transportation of the property, except as
excluded by specific statutory provisions. (Rev. & Tax. Code, § 6012, subd. (a)(3).) In particular,
separately stated charges for transportation from the retailer's place of business or other point from
which shipment is made directly to the purchaser are not included in gross receipts. (Rev. & Tax.
Code, § 6012, subd. (c)(7).) Transportation charges are regarded as separately stated only when those
charges are separately set forth in the contract for sale issued contemporaneously with the sale, such as
the retailer's invoice. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 18, § 1628, subd. (a).)

23 ANALYSIS & DISPOSITION

Initially, we note that petitioner's sales tax worksheets and reports provided to the Department at the time of the audit showed that petitioner added a markup for transportation charges and that the amount of the markup matched the understatement found in the audit. In addition, petitioner's contention that these charges are a "monthly fee" (consisting of the sale of tangible personal property and nontaxable services) and not transportation charges lacks support. Petitioner has not provided any evidence to support its assertion that the charges are a monthly fee consisting in part of service charges. Accordingly, we find that the charges at issue are transportation charges.

Under Revenue and Taxation Code section 6012, subdivision (a)(3), transportation charges are to be included in gross receipts unless otherwise excluded. California Code of Regulations, title 18, section 1628, subdivision (a), states that separately stated transportation charges are not included in gross receipts. Here, the transportation charges were not separately stated on the sales invoices, and petitioner has not argued that they were, and so those charges are not excluded from gross receipts. (Rev. & Tax. Code, § 6012, subd. (c)(7).) Accordingly, we conclude that petitioner owes tax on the amount of transportation charges that were not reported as part of gross receipts, and that there is no overpayment subject to refund for later periods.

ORDER

On November 19, 2013, the Board ordered that the petition and claim for refund be denied, and that the matter be redetermined in accordance with the September 6, 2001, reaudit report.

Adopted at Sacramento, California, on April 22, 2014.

	Jerome E. Horton	,	Chairman		
	Michelle Steel	,	Member		
	Betty T. Yee	,	Member		
	George Runner	,	Member		
	Marcy Jo Mandel	,	Member*		
*For John Chiang, pursuant to Government Code section 7.9.					
SMF Energy Corporation	-3-	NOT TO BE CITI	ED AS PRECE		