

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals

---

APPEAL FROM RICHLAND COUNTY  
Administrative Law Court  
The Honorable Shirley C. Robinson, Administrative Law Judge

---

Case No. 2014-001170

---

South Carolina Department of  
Motor Vehicles

Appellant,

vs.

Russo Dumpster, Inc.,

Respondent.

**RECEIVED**  
SEP 29 2014  
**SC Court of Appeals**

---

**INITIAL BRIEF OF RESPONDENT**

---

**RAYNOR LAW FIRM, PLLC**

Kenneth R. Raynor  
1800 East Blvd.  
Charlotte, North Carolina, 28203  
SC Bar # 11654  
SC Fed. ID No · 6769  
Phone: 704.413.3400  
Fax: 704.731.0774  
Ken@raynorlawfirm.com  
Attorney for Respondent

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Table of Authorities ..... ii

Statement of Issues on Appeal ..... 1

Statement of Facts ..... 1

Discussion..... 2

Conclusion . . . . . 5

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**CASES**

South Carolina Nat'l Bank v. South Carolina Tax Com., 297 S.C. 279,  
280,376 S.E.2d 512, 513, 1989 S.C. LEXIS 1, 1(S C.1989).....5

Tanner Florence County Treasurer, 336 S.C. 552, 563, 521 S.E.2d 153,  
158 (1999). .....5

**STATUTES**

Federal:

49 U S C.A. § 31701 (3)..... 2

49 U.S.C A. § 31705..... 2

State:

S.C. Code Ann § 5-11-20.....2

S.C. Code Ann. § 56-11-40..... 3

International Fuel Tax Agreement Materials:

Articles of Agreement, Articles I, R120 .....2

Articles of Agreement, Articles I, R130 .....2, 4

Articles of Agreement, Article III, R360 ..... 3

Articles of Agreement, Article III, 1310..... 3

Articles of Agreement, Article VII, R700 ..... 3

Procedures V. P530..... 3

## **STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL**

ISSUE 1: THE ALC DID NOT ERR IN UPHOLDING THE HEARING OFFICER'S RESCISSION OF RESPONDENT TAXPAYER'S IFTA AUDIT SUSPENSION ON THE GROUNDS THAT THE APPELLANT FAILED TO DISCHARGE ITS DUTY IMPOSED BY IFTA TO INFORM THE TAXPAYER OF THE RECORD KEEPING REQUIREMENTS IT WAS TRYING TO ENFORCE.

## **STATEMENT OF FACTS**

The Respondent is a licensee with the Appellant under the IFTA. The Appellant is responsible for South Carolina's discharge of duties and obligations owed under the IFTA. The IFTA imposes certain record keeping requirements on licensees and responsible jurisdictions. The IFTA requires the Appellant to provide notice to the Respondent of the record keeping requirements it will impose under the IFTA. The Appellant is charged under the IFTA with the obligation to conduct audits to ensure compliance with the IFTA.

Beginning with an opening conference on November 14, 2011, the Appellant conducted an audit of the Respondent. The Audit covered the period January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2009.

On November 2, 2009, Appellant adopted MC-7, Agreement to Prepare/Maintain Records. This document provides detailed information on the specifics of the records to be kept and maintained by the licensee under IFTA. The Respondent has maintained records in compliance with the requirements set forth in the MC-7 since receiving it.

On January 6, 2011, Respondent signed MC-7 for the first time. There is no evidence in the record that the Appellant provided notice to the Respondent of the specific record keeping requirements under the IFTA prior to this date in 2011.

The Appellant after completing the audit found the records of the Respondent to

be “unacceptable ”

At time of hearing, Russo claimed she had documents which would show some of the information Appellant was looking for.

The Appellant issued an assessment for an additional tax of \$49,667.05 and ultimately suspended the Respondent’s license for its failure to pay the assessment

### **DISCUSSION**

The Department has no problems addressing the Respondent’s duties under the IFTA, in terms of record keeping. The Department fails to address its failure to comply with the IFTA’s mandates to communicate the record keeping requirements to the Respondent. The two duties are connected. As the evidence shows in this case, Compliance by the Department with the IFTA’s requirements to communicate the records requirement to licensee such as the Respondent is key to allowing the licensees to maintain the records to meet an audit

The case arises out of an audit of the Respondent conducted under the provisions of the International Fuel Tax Agreement (IFTA). The Administrative Law Judge’s Order gave an excellent explanation of the IFTA and South Carolina’s involvement with IFTA and reference is made thereto. Basically, the IFTA is an interstate agreement on collecting and distributing fuel use taxes paid by motor carriers. 49 U.S.C A § 31701 (3). Even though the IFTA is not a federal law, the federal government requires that all states engaging in fuel tax collections follow the IFTA provisions. 49 U.S.C.A. § 31705. South Carolina participates in the IFTA pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. § 5-11-20. South Carolina, like all government jurisdictions who agree to participate with the IFTA agrees to comply with its provisions. IFTA, Articles I, R120.

The Respondent is a licensee and operates under a license issued by the Appellant. Licensees, such as the Respondent, are required under the IFTA to maintain certain records to substantiate the information they file on fuel tax returns IFTA, Article VII, R700. The record keeping is designed to verify taxable and non-taxable use for each jurisdiction in which the vehicle was operated.

One of the requirements imposed by the IFTA on jurisdictions such as the Appellant is the duty to conduct audits of its licensees on behalf of all member jurisdictions. IFTA, Article III, 1310. Accordingly, South Carolina law gives the Appellant authority to conduct the audits. S.C. Code Ann. § 56-11-40. A licensee's failure to maintain proper records can result in a revocation of its IFTA license IFTA, Procedures V. P530.

The Appellants' revocation of the Respondent's license following an audit and resulting finding that the Respondent did not maintain adequate records is the act which generated the matter coming to the attention of this court

The IFTA also provides that:

Each jurisdiction shall provide licensees and prospective licensees with all information required to enable them to comply with all the terms of the [IFTA]. When credentials are issues to a new licensee information shall be provided to the licensee which completely describes the requirements of [IFTA]. This should include, but not be limited to:

...300 Tax reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

IFTA, Article III, R360.

Effective November 2009, the Appellant began to use a document referenced as form MC-7 to communicate this information, even though the IFTA recordkeeping requirements have been in effect since July 1, 1998.

The Department did not present this form to the Respondent until January 6, 2011.

The Appellant vigorously contended below that the Respondent's certification made in its yearly application to comply with IFTA record keeping requirements relieved the Appellant of its duty to comply with any requirement under the IFTA to provide notice of the record keeping requirements to the licensees such as the Respondent. However, as the Administrative Law Judge concluded, the promise by the Respondent to comply with the record keeping requirements does not relieve the Appellant of its duty to communicate the requirements to the Respondent. As the Administrative Law Judge concluded, the two provisions of the IFTA, the duty by the Respondent to comply with record keeping requirements and the duty to comply with the duty by the Appellant to inform the licensees of the requirements are related. As the Administrative Law Judge held, "Together, the two provisions ensure parties are aware of IFTA's requirements to better realize the cooperative spirit and purpose of IFTA, which is 'to promote and encourage the fullest and most efficient possible. administration of motor fuels use taxation laws.' IFTA Articles I, R130"

The facts of this case illustrate the connection between the two complimentary duties. Once the Appellant provided notice of the requirements to the Respondent in 2011 by providing the MC-7 form to it, the Respondent complied with the record keeping requirements. Not surprisingly, a thorough explanation of the specific record keeping requirements by the taxing authority to the taxpayer lead to the taxpayer's successful efforts in complying with the requirements.

The effect of the Administrative Law Judge's order upholding the revocation of

the suspension of the Respondent's license is that it required the Appellant, the taxing authority, to comply with its responsibilities under a taxing scheme as a condition to the imposition of taxes or penalties under the scheme. Courts routinely require taxing authorities to comply with their obligations under taxing legislation as a condition to the government pursuing penalties under the taxing scheme. For example, South Carolina Courts have required strict compliance with requisite statutory conditions in tax sale situations. *Tanner Florence County Treasurer*, 336 S C 552, 563, 521 S E 2d 153, 158 (1999). Similarly, it was held that where a taxing authority's notice was untimely, it was barred from collecting taxes for that period of time


*South Carolina Nat'l Bank v South Carolina Tax Com*, 297 S C 279, 280, 376 S E 2d 512, 513, 1989 S C LEXIS 1, 1(S C 1989)

### **CONCLUSION**

The Administrative Law Judge's Order dated March 24, 2014 was a correct application of the law and the duties of the Appellant under the IFTA. The Respondent respectfully prays this Court to affirm the Order.

Date: September 26, 2014

**RAYNOR LAW FIRM, PLLC**



Kenneth R. Raynor

1800 East Blvd.

Charlotte, North Carolina, 28203

SC Bar # 11654

SC Fed ID No · 6769

Phone: 704.413.3400

Fax 704 731.0774

Ken@raynorlawfirm.com

Attorney for Respondent.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In The Court of Appeals

---

APPEAL FROM RICHLAND COUNTY  
Administrative Law Court  
The Honorable Shirley C. Robinson, Administrative Law Judge

---

Case No. 2014-001170

---

South Carolina Department of  
Motor Vehicles

Appellant,

vs.

Russo Dumpster, Inc.,

Respondent.

**RECEIVED**  
SEP 29 2014  
**SC Court of Appeals**

---


**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

---

PURSUANT TO SCAR, I HEREBY CERTIFY that today,  
September 26, 2014, I served one copy of the Respondent's Initial Brief and  
Designation of Matter by depositing with the United States Postal Service,  
correct postage prepaid, to the Appellant's attorney at the address indicated  
below.

Mr. Phillip Porter  
South Carolina Department of Motor Vehicles  
P.O. Box 1498  
Blythewood, SC 29016-0020

**RAYNOR LAW FIRM, PLLC**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kenneth R. Raynor", is written over a horizontal line.

Kenneth R. Raynor

1800 East Blvd.

Charlotte, North Carolina, 28203

SC Bar # 11654

SC Fed. ID No.: 6769

Phone: 704.413.3400

Fax: 704.731.0774

Ken@raynorlawfirm.com

Attorney for Respondent.



**RECEIVED**  
SEP 29 2014  
**SC Court of Appeals**

KENNETH R. RAYNOR  
[ken@raynorlawfirm.com](mailto:ken@raynorlawfirm.com)  
Direct Dial 704 971 5373

*Also Admitted in South Carolina  
Certified Mediator*

1800 East Boulevard  
Charlotte, NC 28203  
Telephone 704 413 3400  
Facsimile 704 731 0774

September 26, 2014

Clerk of Court  
SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS  
1015 Sumter Street  
Columbia, SC 29201

**VIA FEDERAL EXPRESS**

RE: SC Department of Motor Vehicles vs. Russo Dumpster, Inc.  
South Carolina Court of Appeals File No.: 2014-001170

Dear Sir or Madam:

Please file the enclosed original and copy of the Respondent's Brief, Designation of Matter and Certificate of Service, and return the filed copy to me in the enclosed, self-addressed stamped envelope.

I appreciate your assistance in this matter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to give me a call.

Sincerely,

Shawn H. Cook, Paralegal

SHC/

Enclosure(s)

*Copy to*

Mr Phillip Porter

*Electronic Copy To*

Ms Mary Russo

RECEIVED  
SEP 29 2014  
SC Court of Appeals

Page 1 of 1

From (704) 413-3400  
Shawn Cook  
1800 East Blvd  
Charlotte NC 28203  
US



Ship Date 26SEP14  
ActWgt: 1.0 LB  
CAD 106117527/NET3550  
Dims 11 X 1 X 9 IN


Ref # Russo/SC Dept Motor Vehicles  
Invoice #  
PO #  
Dept #  
Ship ID

SHIP TO (803) 734-1890  
Clerk of Court  
SC Court of Appeals  
1015 Sumter Street  
COLUMBIA, SC 29201  
US


BILL SENDER

TRK# 7712 9160 9808


29201



9622 0019 0 (000 743 0145) 2 00 7712 9160 9808



522G1CDB48AC9



**After printing this label**

- 1 Use the 'Print' button on this page to print your label to your laser or inkjet printer
- 2 Fold the printed page along the horizontal line
- 3 Place label in shipping pouch and affix it to your shipment so that the barcode portion of the label can be read and scanned

**Warning IMPORTANT TRANSMIT YOUR SHIPPING DATA AND PRINT A MANIFEST**

At the end of each shipping day, you should perform the FedEx Ground End of Day Close procedure to transmit your shipping data to FedEx. To do so, click on the Ground End of Day Close Button. If required, print the pickup manifest that appears. A printed manifest is required to be tendered along with your packages if they are being picked up by FedEx Ground. If you are dropping your packages off at a FedEx drop off location, the manifest is not required.

Use of this system constitutes your agreement to the service conditions in the current FedEx Service Guide and applicable tariff, available upon request. FedEx will not be responsible for any claim in excess of \$100 per package, whether the result of loss, damage, delay, non-delivery, misdelivery or misinformation, unless you declare a higher value, pay an additional charge, document your actual loss and file a timely claim. Limitations, including limitations on our liability, can be found in the current FedEx Service Guide and applicable tariff apply. In no event shall FedEx Ground be liable for any special, incidental or consequential damages, including, without limitation, loss of profit, loss of the intrinsic value of the package, loss of sale, interest income or attorney's fees. Recovery cannot exceed actual documented loss. Items of extraordinary value are subject to separate limitations of liability set forth in the Service Guide and tariff. Written claims must be filed within strict time limits, see current FedEx Service Guide.

© 2011 FedEx 158396 REV 1/11

Press here to seal.

Press here to seal.

Press here to seal.

Sender: You must seal flap before shipping.

RECEIVED  
SEP 29 2014  
SC Court of Appeals