

# **LITIGATION ROSTER**

## **SPECIAL TAXES**

**SEPTEMBER 2022**

**Special Taxes**  
LITIGATION ROSTER  
SEPTEMBER 2022

**NEW CASES**

**Case Name**

**Case Number**

**CLOSED CASES**

**Case Name**

IPC (USA), INC. v. CDTFA  
SWARTZ v. CA DEPT. OF TAX & FEE ADMIN.

**Case Number**

34-2021-00310045  
BCV-20-102242

Please refer to the case roster for more detail regarding new and closed cases

**Special Taxes**  
**LITIGATION ROSTER**  
**SEPTEMBER 2022**

---

**SPRINT TELEPHONY PCS, L.P. v. CDTFA**  
Sacramento County Superior Court: 34-2021-00296518  
Filed – 03/15/2021

*Plaintiffs' Counsel*

Timothy A. Gustafson, Eversheds Sutherland

*CDTFA's Counsel*

Lauren Freeman

*CDTFA Attorney*

Andrew Amara

---

Issue(s):

Plaintiff contends that it is entitled to a refund of \$1,420,371.00 in overpaid electronic waste recycling fees (“e-waste fees”) for the period of April 1, 2013 to March 31, 2016, because the tablet devices it sold were not specifically identified as “covered electronic devices” (“CEDs”) in the Department of Toxic Substances Control’s (“DTSC”) regulations and were therefore not subject to the e-waste fee. [Public Resources Code section 42463, subdivision \(e\)\(1\)](#), provides that a CED is “a video display device . . . that is identified in the regulations adopted by” DTSC. Plaintiff further contends that it is not liable for e-waste fees when a manufacturer of a CED fails to send the required notice to a retailer that their device meets the definition of a CED and are subject to e-waste fees.

Audit/Tax Period: April 1, 2013 to March 31, 2016

Amount: \$1,420,371.00

Status:

Plaintiff filed its verified complaint on March 15, 2021, and served it on CDTFA on March 22, 2021. CDTFA received an extension to file its responsive pleading by May 6, 2021. The parties have agreed to stay the action while Plaintiff exhausts its administrative remedies with the CDTFA, and will file a stipulation to stay the action with the court. The court entered the Order to Stay Case Pending Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies on May 12, 2021.

---

**STARBUZZ TOBACCO, INC., A CALIFORNIA CORPORATION, AND STARBUZZ INTERNATIONAL, INC., A CALIFORNIA CORPORATION v. CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF TAX APPEALS, ET AL.**

Los Angeles County Superior Court: 22STCP02300

Orange County Superior Court: 30-2021-01222965-CU-WM-CJC

Filed – 09/21/2021

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Mardiros Dakessian, Dakessian Law, LTD

CDTFA's Counsel

Michael von Loewenfeldt, Wagstaffe, von Loewenfeldt, Busch & Radwick LLP

CDTFA Attorney

Kiren Chohan

---

Issue(s):

Starbuzz Tobacco, Inc. and Starbuzz International, Inc. (“Petitioners”) filed a Verified Petition for Writ of Mandate or Administrative Mandate (“Petition”) against the Office of Tax Appeals (“OTA”) as the Respondent, and named CDTFA as the Real Party in Interest. In its Petition, Petitioners seek a peremptory writ of mandate or, alternatively, peremptory writ of administrative mandate, to command OTA to rescind its September 9, 2021 decision granting CDTFA's petition for rehearing and to deny the same. Petitioners' pending appeal before OTA involves the CDTFA's denial of Petitioners' refund claims totaling \$2,818,739, for the combined period October 1, 2012, through September 30, 2015, for Petitioners' taxable distributions of shisha under the Cigarette and Tobacco Products Tax Law. On April 28, 2021, OTA issued its decision granting Petitioners' refund claims, finding that Petitioners' shisha distributions were not subject to the tobacco products excise tax. On May 26, 2021, CDTFA timely filed a petition for rehearing with the OTA because the OTA's decision was contrary to the law, which was granted by the OTA. Petitioners seek to stay all further proceedings before the OTA on CDTFA's petition for rehearing until the court decides the Petition. Petitioners also seek attorneys' fees.

Audit/Tax Period: None

Amount: \$2,818,739.00

Status:

CDTFA was served with the Petition on September 29, 2021. On October 21, 2021, Petitioners served CDTFA with a First Amended Verified Petition for Writ of Mandate or Administrative Mandate ("FAP"). On October 22, 2021, OTA filed a Motion to Transfer Venue, scheduled to be heard on March 14, 2022. On

November 19, 2021, CDTFA filed its Motion to Transfer Venue. The hearing on this motion is scheduled for March 21, 2022. On March 4, 2022, petitioners filed an opposition to OTA's Motion for Transfer of Venue. On March 7, 2022, OTA filed a reply brief in support of its motion. On March 9, 2022, petitioners filed an opposition to CDTFA's Motion to Transfer Venue and a sur-reply responding to OTA's reply in support of its Motion to Transfer Venue. On March 11, 2022, the trial court issued a tentative ruling granting OTA's Motion to Transfer Venue to Los Angeles County Superior Court. Following oral argument on March 14, 2022, the court continued the hearings on OTA's Motion to Transfer Venue, as well as the hearing on CDTFA's Motion to Transfer Venue and the case management conference, to May 9, 2022. On May 9, 2022, the court granted the Office of Tax Appeals' and CDTFA's motions to transfer the case to Los Angeles County Superior Court. On June 17, 2022, the Los Angeles County Superior Court sent notice of receipt of the case from the Orange County Superior Court. CDTFA's deadline to file a response to the petition is July 18, 2022. On June 23, 2022, CDTFA received notice that the court has scheduled a trial setting conference on September 20, 2022. Petitioners granted CDTFA a 15-day extension to respond to the Petition. CDTFA's deadline for a responsive pleading is August 2, 2022. On July 18, 2022, OTA filed a Demurrer to the Petition, and the hearing on the Demurrer is scheduled for August 18, 2022. On July 21, 2022, the parties filed a Stipulated Joinder in Demurrer, whereby the parties agreed that the pending Demurrer filed by OTA will be treated as if it were filed by both OTA and CDTFA without the need for CDTFA to file any further documents concerning the Demurrer. On August 5, 2022, petitioners filed an opposition to the Demurrer filed by OTA and CDTFA. On August 11, 2022, OTA filed a reply in support of its Demurrer. On August 17, 2022, pursuant to the parties' stipulation, the court continued the Demurrer hearing and trial setting conference to October 4, 2022. Pursuant to an approved settlement by the parties, Petitioners filed a request for dismissal on September 1, 2022, which was entered by the court that same date. This matter is now concluded and will be closed.

---

**STESHENKO, GREGORY v. California Board of Equalization, et al.**

Sacramento County Superior Court: 34-2016-00202671-CU-CR-GDS

Santa Cruz County Superior Court: 16CV007757

Filed – 03/25/2016

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Gregory Steshenko, Pro Se

CDTFA's Counsel

Robert E. Asperger

CDTFA Attorney

Kiren Chohan

---

Issue(s):

Plaintiff contends that the fire prevention fee Assembly Bill 29 [AB 29](#) is invalid and unconstitutional, and that exempt funds were illegally seized.

Audit/Tax Period: None

Amount: Unspecified

Status:

On June 28, 2016, the BOE filed its Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion to Transfer Action to Sacramento County Superior Court. At the July 6, 2016 hearing, the Court granted the Motion for Change of Venue to Sacramento County Superior Court. On August 29, 2016, the BOE's Proposed Order for change of venue to Sacramento was submitted to Plaintiff for approval as to form. On September 8, 2016, the DAG sent a signed letter to the Court submitting the Proposed Order granting Motion for change of venue, with attachments. On September 28, 2016, the Court entered an Order, transferring the case to Sacramento County Superior Court. On October 11, 2016, Plaintiff filed a petition for writ of mandate with the Sixth Appellate District. The Santa Cruz Superior Court has transferred the case to Sacramento County Superior Court. Sacramento County Superior Court has scheduled a case management conference for May 4, 2017. The case management statement is due April 19, 2017. On February 28, 2017, the Court of Appeal denied the petition for writ of mandate and request for stay. On March 21, 2017, Defendants BOE and CalFIRE filed a demurrer and Motion to strike. The hearing on these moving papers is scheduled for April 27, 2017. On April 26, 2017, the Court continued the hearing to June 2, 2017. On April 27, 2017, the Court issued its tentative ruling on the CMC set for May 4, 2017. It requires the parties to choose trial and settlement conference dates before the end of the year. The hearing on BOE's Demurrer has been continued to July 7, 2017. At the July 7, 2017 hearing, the trial court sustained

the demurrers of Defendants California Board of Equalization, the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, and Andres Lopez as to the second through fourth causes of action of the complaint; and stayed the entire action on the grounds that there is another action pending between the same parties on the same cause of action. On July 19, 2017, [Assembly Bill 398](#) was adopted to add [Public Resources section 4213.05](#), which effective July 1, 2017, suspends the fire prevention fee until January 1, 2031. On August 3, 2017, the Court entered an order sustaining the Board's demurrer to the second through fourth causes of action and staying the first cause of action on the grounds that there is another action pending between the same parties (the Howard Jarvis case). There has been no action since then. On December 30, 2017, plaintiff filed a motion to lift the stay on this action. No Hearing date has been set. On January 16, 2018, plaintiff filed a Motion to Lift the stay in this action. The hearing on plaintiff's Motion to Lift the stay in this action is April 18, 2018. On April 8, 2018, plaintiff filed a Reply to his Motion to Lift the Stay of proceedings in this case. On April 18, 2018, the court adopted its Tentative Ruling and denied Plaintiff's Motion to Lift the Stay.

**Special Taxes**  
**LITIGATION ROSTER**  
**SEPTEMBER 2022**

**CLOSED CASES**

**Case Name**

IPC (USA), INC. v. CDTFA  
SWARTZ v. CA DEPT. OF TAX & FEE

**Case Number**

34-2021-00310045  
BCV-20-102242

**DISCLAIMER**

Every attempt has been made to ensure the information contained herein is valid and accurate at the time of publication. However, the tax laws are complex and subject to change. If there is a conflict between the law and the information found, decisions will be made based on the law.

Links to information on sites not maintained by the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration (CDTFA) are provided only as a public service. The CDTFA is not responsible for the content and accuracy of the information on those sites.