

MAR 16 2007

ORDERED PUBLISHED

**HAROLD S. MARENUS, CLERK
U.S. BKCY. APP. PANEL
OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY APPELLATE PANEL
OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

In re:)	BAP No.	CC-06-1207-MoDK
)		
ERNEST LEAL and MARIA LEAL)	Bk. No.	LA 04-31307 EC
)		
Debtors.)		
_____)		
STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION,)		
an agency of the State of)		
California,)		
)		
Appellant,)		
)		
v.)	<u>OPINION</u>	
)		
ERNEST LEAL; MARIA LEAL,)		
)		
Appellees.)		
_____)		

Argued and Submitted on February 22, 2007
at Pasadena, California

Filed - March 16, 2007

Appeal from the United States Bankruptcy Court
for the Central District of California

Hon. Ellen Carroll, Bankruptcy Judge, Presiding.

Before: MONTALI, DUNN and KLEIN, Bankruptcy Judges.

1 MONTALI, Bankruptcy Judge:

2

3 The bankruptcy court ruled that debtors Ernest and Maria Leal
4 ("Debtors") have no personal liability for unpaid sales taxes from
5 a retail shoe business, even assuming that they were partners in
6 the business, because there was no evidence that they were
7 responsible for or willfully failed to pay the sales taxes. We
8 hold that nothing in Cal. Rev. & Tax Code section 6829¹ operates
9 as a shield against the joint and several liability of general
10 partners. Accordingly, we REVERSE and REMAND.

11

I. FACTS

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

¹ We refer to the California Revenue and Taxation Code as the "Cal. Rev. & Tax Code" and the California Corporations Code as the "Cal. Corp. Code." The term "Chapter 7" refers to Chapter 7 of the Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. §§ 101-1328 (prior to amendment by The Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005, Pub. L. 109-8, 119 Stat. 23, because the case from which this appeal arises was filed before its effective date, which is generally October 17, 2005).

28

1 Stanley signed a Business License Tax Application that was filed
2 with the City of Rancho Mirage. Next to Debtor Maria Leal's
3 signature in what appears to be her handwriting is the word, "co-
4 owner."

5 Debtor Maria Leal alleges that she visited the Desert Shoes
6 store approximately three times after it opened and that Debtors
7 "invested/loaned over \$50,000.00 in capital and credit for the
8 benefit of the Stanleys" but that Debtors never were involved in
9 any operational aspects of the business and signed no checks from
10 its accounts. Several months after the store opened the Stanleys
11 started avoiding contact with Debtors. Debtors eventually were
12 told by Mr. Stanley that he had closed the store because its lease
13 was in default.

14 Meanwhile, some creditors of Desert Shoes brought actions
15 against Debtor Maria Leal as a partner of or d/b/a Desert Shoes.
16 At least one default judgment was entered against her.

17 Debtors filed their voluntary Chapter 7 petition on October
18 6, 2004 (the "Petition Date"). Their bankruptcy Schedule E states
19 that they have no priority debts. They do not list the State
20 Board of Equalization, an agency of the State of California (the
21 "SBE"), among their creditors. Nevertheless, most of their debts
22 appear to be business debts related to Desert Shoes, their
23 bankruptcy Schedule G lists the Desert Shoes lease, and their
24 Statement of Financial Affairs, item 18, lists Desert Shoes as a
25 business "in which the debtor was an officer, director, partner,
26 or managing executive." Debtors received their discharge and
27 their bankruptcy case was closed.

28 Thereafter Debtors began to receive correspondence and

1 telephone calls from the SBE regarding Desert Shoes' unpaid sales
2 taxes in the amount of approximately \$20,000. The SBE alleges
3 that in the course of its calls with Debtor Maria Leal she
4 admitted that she was a "silent partner" in Desert Shoes.

5 Debtors filed a motion to reopen their Chapter 7 case, which
6 the bankruptcy court granted, and a motion to determine the
7 validity of the alleged sales tax debts and tax liens against
8 them, which the SBE opposed. The latter motion came on for
9 hearing on May 31, 2006.

10 The SBE argued that both Debtors were in a general
11 partnership with the Stanleys and as such they have joint and
12 several liability for sales taxes. The SBE sought an evidentiary
13 hearing on whether or not a partnership existed. The bankruptcy
14 court assumed for the sake of discussion that there was a
15 partnership but ruled that under Cal. Rev. & Tax Code section 6829
16 "the person that you want to have be responsible for these taxes
17 has to have control or supervision or be charged with
18 responsibility for filing tax returns and paying taxes" and must
19 have "willfully failed to pay the taxes," and there was
20 "absolutely no evidence" of either of these things. Transcript,
21 May 31, 2006, p. 15:3-11. The bankruptcy court granted Debtors'
22 motion to determine tax liability and ordered that any assessments
23 for taxes, interest, and penalties for "all tax periods commencing
24 March 1, 2002, through May 31, 2006,^[2] inclusive, shall be

25 _____
26 ² This time period extends beyond the Petition Date, but it
27 appears that no shoes were being sold after that date. In any
28 event, based upon our questions at oral argument no party appears
to assert that the bankruptcy court's jurisdiction under 11 U.S.C.
(continued...)

1 expunged and disallowed in its entirety.” The bankruptcy court
2 also directed the SBE to “cause to release or withdraw any tax
3 lien filed against the Debtors for [Desert Shoes’] tax debts” to
4 the SBE incurred during the same period. The SBE filed a timely
5 notice of appeal.

6 **II. ISSUE**

7 Does Cal. Rev. & Tax Code section 6829 shield debtors from
8 whatever joint and several liability they may have as general
9 partners with the Stanleys in the Desert Shoes business?

10 **III. STANDARD OF REVIEW**

11 We review the bankruptcy court’s interpretation of state law
12 de novo. Conestoga Servs. Corp. v. Exec. Risk Indem., Inc., 312
13 F.3d 976, 981 (9th Cir. 2002).

14 **IV. DISCUSSION**

15 Most tax claims are nondischargeable in bankruptcy. See 11
16 U.S.C. §§ 523(a)(1) and 507(a)(8). Debtors argue that they have
17 no sales tax liability at all.

18 We assume without deciding that neither Debtor had
19 responsibility for paying sales taxes or any other involvement in
20 operating the Desert Shoes business. That is not enough to excuse
21 one or both of them from joint and several liability for the
22 nonpayment of sales taxes, if in fact one or both are liable as
23 general partners. Under the Revised Uniform Partnership Act as
24 enacted in California, “all partners are liable jointly and
25 severally for all obligations of the partnership unless otherwise

26
27 ²(...continued)
28 § 505 or otherwise would extend to post-petition sales in this
Chapter 7 case. We assume without deciding that it does not.

1 agreed by the claimant or provided by law." Cal. Corp. Code
2 § 16306(a). See also Young v. Riddell, 283 F.2d 909, 910 (9th
3 Cir. 1960) (even secret or dormant partner was still subject to
4 joint and several liability, including for tax debts of bankrupt
5 partnership).

6 There are some exceptions within Cal. Corp. Code section
7 16306(a) itself. Partners are not liable for obligations incurred
8 before their admission as a partner, and partners in a limited
9 partnership are not personally liable for the limited
10 partnership's debts. Cal. Corp. Code § 16306(b), (c). Debtors
11 argue that there is another exception for any sales tax liability,
12 established by Cal. Rev. & Tax Code section 6829. That section
13 provides in relevant part:

14 (a) Notwithstanding Section 16306, 16307, 17101,
15 17158, 17355, 17450, or 17456 of the Corporations Code,
16 upon termination, dissolution, or abandonment of a
17 partnership, a registered or foreign limited liability
18 partnership or a domestic or foreign corporate or
19 limited liability company business, any officer, member,
20 manager, partner, or other person having control or
21 supervision of, or who is charged with the
22 responsibility for the filing of returns or the payment
23 of tax, or who is under a duty to act for the
24 corporation, partnership, limited liability partnership,
25 or limited liability company in complying with any
26 requirement of this part, shall be personally liable for
27 any unpaid taxes and interest and penalties on those
28 taxes, if the officer, member, manager, or other person
willfully fails to pay or to cause to be paid any taxes
due from the corporation, partnership, limited liability
partnership, or limited liability company pursuant to
this part.

24 Cal. Rev. & Tax Code § 6829(a) (emphasis added).

25 The bankruptcy court agreed with Debtors. It read the
26 introductory clause in the above quote -- "[n]otwithstanding
27 Section 16306 . . . of the Corporations Code" -- to mean that Cal.
28 Rev. & Tax Code section 6829 supplants Cal. Corp. Code section

1 16306 on the issue of sales tax liability. We disagree.

2 As Debtors' counsel conceded at oral argument before us,
3 "notwithstanding" generally means "despite." Cal. Rev. & Tax Code
4 section 6829 provides for liability despite various statutes that
5 would otherwise exonerate a person from liability. This makes
6 sense. Persons who are responsible for filing returns or paying
7 sales taxes are liable if they willfully fail to remit sales taxes
8 to the SBE, notwithstanding that some persons such as limited
9 partners are not liable for most partnership debts under Cal.
10 Corp. Code section 16306.³

11 The same reasoning applies to the other statutes listed in
12 the "notwithstanding" clause of Cal. Rev. & Tax Code section 6829.
13 All of those statutes include potential protections from
14 liability. See, e.g., Cal. Corp. Code § 17101(a) (in general, "no
15 member of a limited liability company shall be personally liable
16 under any judgment of a court, or in any other manner, for any

17 _____
18 ³ The relevant provisions of Cal. Corp. Code section 16306
state:

19 (b) A person admitted as a partner into an existing
20 partnership is not personally liable for any partnership
21 obligation incurred before the person's admission as a
partner.

22 (c) Notwithstanding any other section of this chapter, and
subject to subdivisions (d), (e), (f), and (h), a partner in
23 a registered limited liability partnership is not liable or
accountable, directly or indirectly, including by way of
24 indemnification, contribution, assessment, or otherwise, for
debts, obligations, or liabilities of or chargeable to the
25 partnership or another partner in the partnership, whether
arising in tort, contract, or otherwise, that are incurred,
26 created, or assumed by the partnership while the partnership
is a registered limited liability partnership, by reason of
27 being a partner or acting in the conduct of the business or
activities of the partnership.

28 Cal. Corp. Code § 16306(b) and (c).

1 debt, obligation, or liability of the limited liability company").
2 Notwithstanding such protections, section 6829 imposes liability
3 on persons who are responsible for sales taxes but willfully fail
4 to remit those taxes to the SBE.⁴

5 We conclude that Cal. Rev. & Tax Code section 6829 does not
6 protect Debtors from any liability they may have as general
7 partners under Cal. Corp. Code section 16306(a). The bankruptcy
8 court should have granted the SBE's request for an evidentiary
9 hearing to determine whether Debtors were general partners in
10 Desert Shoes.

11 Our conclusion is supported by the existence of Cal. Rev. &
12 Tax Code section 6487.2(b), which protects general partners from
13 personal liability after expiration of a limitations period.⁵ The
14

15 ⁴ See also Cal. Corp. Code § 16307(b) and (c) (creditor of a
16 partnership generally cannot collect from a partner without first
17 obtaining a judgment against the partnership and levying against
18 partnership property); Cal. Corp. Code § 17158(a) (in general,
19 "[n]o person who is a manager or officer or both a manager and
20 officer of a limited liability company shall be personally liable
21 under any judgment of a court, or in any other manner, for any
22 debt, obligation, or liability of the limited liability company");
23 Cal. Corp. Code § 17355(a)(1)(B) ("Causes of action against a
24 dissolved limited liability company" generally may be enforced
25 against "members of the dissolved limited liability company" but
26 only "to the extent of the limited liability company assets
27 distributed to them upon dissolution of the limited liability
28 company."); Cal. Corp. Code § 17450(a) ("The laws of the state or
foreign country under which a foreign limited liability company is
organized shall govern its organization and internal affairs and
the liability and authority of its managers and members."); and
Cal. Corp. Code § 17456(c) ("A member of a foreign limited
liability company is not liable for the debts and obligations of
the foreign limited liability company solely by reason of its
having transacted business in this state without registration.").

26 ⁵ The statute provides, with inapplicable exceptions:

27 (b) An individual who was a general partner, as shown on
28 the board's records, who withdraws from a partnership without
(continued...)

1 statute of limitations itself is irrelevant to this appeal --
2 nobody argues that it is a defense -- but there would be no need
3 for the California legislature to enact a statute of limitations
4 directed specifically to protecting general partners from sales
5 tax liability if, as Debtors argue, general partners were not
6 liable for unpaid sales taxes in the first place.

7 Another aspect of the statutory scheme also supports our
8 analysis. In general a creditor of a partnership cannot collect
9 from a partner without first obtaining a judgment against the
10 partnership and levying against partnership property. See Cal.
11 Corp. Code § 16307(c) and (d). The SBE is granted an exception to
12 that rule in some circumstances. See Cal. Rev. & Tax Code § 6831
13 ("The [SBE] shall not be subject to subdivisions (c) and (d) of
14 Section 16307 of the Corporations Code unless, at the time of
15 application for a seller's permit, the applicant furnishes to the
16 board a written partnership agreement that provides that all
17 business assets shall be held in the name of the partnership.").
18 There would be no point in providing this limited exception to
19 liability if, as Debtors argue, general partners were already
20 protected from liability by Cal. Rev. & Tax Code section 6829.

21 We see no ambiguity in the statutory scheme described above,
22 but even if there were some ambiguity the SBE cites legislative
23

24 ⁵ (...continued)
25 notifying the board of the change in ownership, shall not be
26 liable for any unpaid, self-assessed liability of the
27 partnership that becomes due at least three years after the
last day of the calendar month following the quarterly period
in which the change in ownership occurred.

28 Cal. Rev. & Tax Code § 6487.2(b).

1 history that supports our analysis. When the California
2 legislature was considering adoption of the Revised Uniform
3 Partnership Act the SBE asked that the bill be amended to add Cal.
4 Rev. & Tax Code section 6831 and thereby preserve its existing
5 rights to collect from partners directly:

6 The [SBE] argues that existing law allows a tax
7 agency like the [SBE] to immediately pursue not only the
8 partnership's assets, but also the assets of each
9 partner to settle an outstanding debt. Under this bill
10 [to adopt the Revised Uniform Partnership Act], it would
11 require all collection remedies against a partnership to
12 be exhausted before collection actions could be taken
13 against any partners. This bill would cause an increase
14 in the cost of collections and delays in collecting a
15 partner's debts.

16 The [SBE] requests an amendment to allow it to
17 continue the current collection practices on partners
18 and partnerships.

19 Senate Jud. Comm. Analysis, A.B. 583, July 2, 1996 (1995-96 Reg.
20 Sess.), pp. 10-11.

21 The California legislature was persuaded. The bill was
22 amended to add Cal. Rev. & Tax Code section 6831 to "allow the
23 [SBE] to continue the current tax collection practices on partners
24 and partnerships." Senate Rules Comm. Analysis, A.B. 583, August
25 23, 1996 (1995-96 Reg. Sess.), p. 3, ¶ 6.

26 Finally, courts interpreting other states' partnership
27 statutes have held that a partner is liable for the partnership's
28 unpaid taxes even though the partner was not personally
responsible for paying those taxes. See Livingston v. United
States, 793 F. Supp. 251, 254 (D. Idaho 1992) (applying Idaho law,
and rejecting argument similar to Debtors' argument in this case);
In re Norton, 158 B.R. 834 (Bankr. D. Idaho 1993) (applying Utah
law and following Livingston).

1 For all of these reasons we reject Debtors' attempt to use
2 Cal. Rev. & Tax Code section 6829 as a shield from liability.
3 That statute was intended to give the SBE another tool to collect
4 sales taxes from persons responsible for such collection, not to
5 protect partners from any joint and several liability they would
6 otherwise have.

7 **V. CONCLUSION**

8 We express no opinion whether either Debtor actually was a
9 general partner in Desert Shoes. The bankruptcy court can address
10 that issue on remand. We simply hold that Debtors cannot use Cal.
11 Rev. & Tax Code section 6829 as a shield against liability if in
12 fact they are general partners. Accordingly, the bankruptcy
13 court's order granting Debtors' motion to determine tax liability
14 is REVERSED and the matter is REMANDED.

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28