

Corrections to this opinion/decision not affecting the outcome, at the Court's discretion, can occur up to the time of publication with NM Compilation Commission. The Court will ensure that the electronic version of this opinion/decision is updated accordingly in Odyssey.

1 **IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO**

Court of Appeals of New Mexico  
Filed 4/24/2024 9:58 AM

2 **SARAH MAESTAS BARNES,**



Ramon J. Maestas  
Chief Clerk

3 Protestant-Appellee,

4 v.

**No. A-1-CA-40461**

5 **NEW MEXICO TAXATION &**  
6 **REVENUE DEPARTMENT,**

7 Respondent-Appellant,

8 **IN THE MATTER OF THE PROTEST**  
9 **TO ASSESSMENT ISSUED UNDER**  
10 **LETTER ID NO. 11302456752.**

11 **APPEAL FROM THE ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS OFFICE**  
12 **Chris Romero, Administrative Hearing Officer**

13 Spencer Fane LLP  
14 Frank Crociata  
15 Scott Woody  
16 Phoenix, AZ

17 for Appellee

18 Raúl Torrez, Attorney General  
19 Cordelia Anna Friedman, Special Assistant Attorney General  
20 Santa Fe, NM

21 for Appellant

22 **MEMORANDUM OPINION**

23 **BACA, Judge.**

24 {1} New Mexico Taxation and Revenue Department (TRD) appeals from the  
25 Administrative Hearing Officer's (AHO) "Decision and Order" concluding that

1 Taxpayer Sarah Maestas Barnes received no taxable gross receipts, granting  
2 Taxpayer’s protest and abating, in full, the assessment against Taxpayer by TRD  
3 based on the alleged gross receipts. TRD argues on appeal that because Taxpayer’s  
4 documentary evidence was unreliable or otherwise infirm, the AHO’s conclusion  
5 was supported only by witness testimony. Based on this assertion, TRD further  
6 contends that witness testimony is alone insufficient to substantiate the AHO’s  
7 conclusion that Taxpayer received no taxable gross receipts. For the following  
8 reasons, we affirm.

9 **BACKGROUND**

10 {2} Because this is an unpublished memorandum opinion written solely for the  
11 benefit of the parties, *see State v. Gonzales*, 1990-NMCA-040, ¶ 48, 110 N.M. 218,  
12 794 P.2d 361, and the parties are familiar with the factual and procedural background  
13 of this case, we omit a background section and leave the discussion of the facts for  
14 our analysis of the issues.

15 **DISCUSSION**

16 **I. Standard of Review for Administrative Decisions**

17 {3} In reviewing agency decisions, we apply the whole record standard of review  
18 and consider all the evidence below. *Duke City Lumber Co. v. N.M. Env’t*  
19 *Improvement Bd.*, 1984-NMSC-042, ¶¶ 13, 14, 101 N.M. 291, 681 P.2d 717. We  
20 may reverse the AHO’s decision only if that decision is “(1) arbitrary, capricious or

1 an abuse of discretion; (2) not supported by substantial evidence in the record; or (3)  
2 otherwise not in accordance with the law.” NMSA 1978, § 7-1-25(C) (2015). “The  
3 party challenging an agency decision bears the burden on appeal of showing that  
4 agency action falls within one of the oft-mentioned grounds.” *Regents of Univ. of*  
5 *N.M. v. N.M. Fed’n of Tchrs.*, 1998-NMSC-020, ¶ 17, 125 N.M. 401, 962 P.2d 1236  
6 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).

7 **II. TRD’s Argument That Witness Testimony Is Alone Insufficient to**  
8 **Substantiate the AHO’s Decision and Order**

9 {4} TRD states that “the issue before [this Court] is not whether Taxpayer  
10 presented substantial evidence to support the [AHO]’s decision, but rather whether  
11 the [Decision and Order]’s conclusions that Taxpayer *did not* receive taxable  
12 receipts is supported by substantial evidence in the record.” TRD asserts that witness  
13 testimony is alone insufficient to substantiate the AHO’s conclusion that Taxpayer  
14 received no taxable receipts. Specifically, TRD contends that “[t]he [AHO] exalted  
15 the unsubstantiated statements of Taxpayer’s witnesses over the content of the  
16 documentary evidence to the contrary and, in so doing, overlooked the documentary  
17 evidence in favor of less reliable and uncorroborated testimony and evidence.”  
18 Further, regarding the testimony in support of Taxpayer, TRD argues that “[t]his  
19 testimony was speculative, lacked foundation or support of documentary proof . . .  
20 and was unsubstantiated or contrary to the admitted documentary evidence.” In

1 asserting that the AHO’s conclusion was supported only by witness testimony, TRD  
2 alleges various infirmities with Taxpayer’s presented documentary evidence.

3 {5} “Substantial evidence is evidence that a reasonable mind would regard as  
4 adequate to support a conclusion.” *Id.* (internal quotation marks and citation  
5 omitted). “[T]he question is not whether substantial evidence exists to support the  
6 opposite result, but rather whether such evidence supports the result reached.”  
7 *Wilcox v. N.M. Bd. of Acupuncture & Oriental Med.*, 2012-NMCA-106, ¶ 7, 288  
8 P.3d 902 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). “We view the evidence in  
9 the light most favorable to the decision, but may not view favorable evidence with  
10 total disregard to contravening evidence. This Court neither reweighs the evidence  
11 nor replaces the [AHO]’s conclusions with its own.” *Bernalillo Cnty. Health Care*  
12 *Corp. v. N.M. Pub. Regul. Comm’n*, 2014-NMSC-008, ¶ 26, 319 P.3d 1284 (internal  
13 quotation marks and citation omitted). Finally, “[i]f more than one inference can be  
14 drawn from the evidence then the inference drawn by the [AHO] is conclusive.”  
15 *Kewanee Indus., Inc. v. Reese*, 1993-NMSC-006, ¶ 6, 114 N.M. 784, 845 P.2d 1238.

16 {6} We first address TRD’s assertion that Taxpayer’s testimony is alone  
17 insufficient to substantiate the AHO’s conclusion that Taxpayer received no taxable  
18 receipts. We disagree with this assertion.

19 {7} TRD’s argument ignores “the fact that it is well-settled in New Mexico that  
20 the testimony of a single witness, if found credible by the fact-finder, is sufficient to

1 constitute substantial evidence.” *Process Equip. & Serv. Co., Inc. v. N.M. Tax’n*  
2 *Revenue Dep’t*, 2023-NMCA-060, ¶ 31, 534 P.3d 1043, *cert. denied* (S-1-SC-40073,  
3 Oct. 11, 2023); *Autrey v. Autrey*, 2022-NMCA-042, ¶ 9, 516 P.3d 207 (same), *cert.*  
4 *granted* (S-1-SC-39371, Aug. 10, 2022), *cert. quashed* (S-1-SC-39371, June 28,  
5 2023). Here, Taxpayer’s testimony was found to be credible by the AHO. Because

6 [i]t is the sole responsibility of the [AHO] to weigh the testimony,  
7 determine the credibility of the witnesses, reconcile inconsistencies,  
8 and determine where the truth lies, . . . we, as the reviewing court, do  
9 not weigh the credibility of live witnesses. Thus, the [AHO]’s  
10 credibility determinations stand on appeal.

11 *N.M. Tax’n & Revenue Dep’t v. Casias Trucking*, 2014-NMCA-099, ¶ 23, 336 P.3d  
12 436 (alteration, internal quotation marks, and citation omitted). What’s more,  
13 “[c]redibility is not determined by the number of witnesses.” *State v. Soliz*, 1969-  
14 NMCA-043, ¶ 8, 80 N.M. 297, 454 P.2d 779.

15 {8} Additionally, although relevant to the next issue we will discuss, we consider  
16 instructive on this point as well, what this Court stated in *Gemini Las Colinas, LLC*  
17 *v. New Mexico Taxation & Revenue Department*, 2023-NMCA-039, 531 P.3d 622.  
18 There, in a case similar to the present case, “[the t]axpayer sought to rebut the  
19 presumption [of correctness] factually, by coming forward with some countervailing  
20 evidence tending to dispute the factual correctness of the assessment.” *Id.* ¶ 37  
21 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). To do so, “[the t]axpayer introduced  
22 evidence in the form of sworn testimony that the tax form relied upon by the [TRD]

1 to assess [the t]axpayer’s tax liability . . . did not accurately represent [the t]axpayer’s  
2 . . . revenue for the purpose of determining gross receipts tax liability.” *Id.* In *Gemini*  
3 *Las Colinas, LLC*, this Court concluded:

4       This testimony went beyond mere conclusory statements: it provided a  
5 specific rationale for why the relevant rental revenue was not accurately  
6 represented on the tax forms. In essence, [the t]axpayer’s testimonial  
7 evidence sought to show that, because the tax form in question was filed  
8 by [the t]axpayer’s parent company, and because that parent company  
9 is principally owned by a real estate investment trust, the income  
10 reported on [the form] was subject to certain adjustments and ultimately  
11 reflected a stripped down version of the rent that was inaccurate for  
12 gross receipts tax purposes. Even if this evidence may be susceptible to  
13 criticism, we believe that it nevertheless went beyond mere  
14 unsubstantiated statements, and clearly tended to dispute the factual  
15 correctness of the assessment. It was relevant to the [TRD]’s  
16 assessment method and included a factual basis for concluding that the  
17 form underrepresented [the t]axpayer’s rental income.

18 *Id.* (alteration, internal quotation marks, and citation omitted).

19 {9} Here, like in *Gemini Las Colinas, LLC*, Taxpayer’s testimony went beyond  
20 mere conclusory statements: it provided specific rationale as to why the Social  
21 Security Administration Forms 1099-MISC (SSA 1099s) were incorrect and why  
22 Taxpayer did not receive the income reported on them. Taxpayer’s testimony is  
23 alone sufficient to provide substantial evidence to support the AHO’s decision.

24 {10} Next, we address TRD’s contention that Taxpayer’s testimony stands alone.  
25 As to this contention, TRD relies on *Casias Trucking* and argues that the “[AHO]  
26 exalted the unsubstantiated statements of Taxpayer’s witnesses over the content of  
27 the documentary evidence to the contrary and, in so doing, overlooked the

1 documentary evidence in favor of less reliable and uncorroborated testimony and  
2 evidence.” See *Casias Trucking*, 2014-NMCA-099, ¶ 8 (“[U]nsubstantiated  
3 statements that the assessment is incorrect cannot overcome the presumption of  
4 correctness. Absent a showing of incorrectness by taxpayers, the audit and notice of  
5 assessment of taxes must stand.” (internal quotation marks and citations omitted)).  
6 In so arguing, TRD asserts that the AHO gave too much credence to the affidavit of  
7 Feliz Martone because it was not testimony from a live, disinterested witness. TRD  
8 additionally argues that “[t]he Department was denied a crucial tool in its inability  
9 to cross-examine Ms. Martone as to her statements about the facts of this case.” We  
10 turn now to address these arguments.

11 {11} We first note that the rule governing evidence at hearings under the New  
12 Mexico Tax Administration Act provides that the “New Mexico rules of  
13 evidence . . . shall not apply in any matter before the administrative hearings office”  
14 and in fact provides that “[r]eliable hearsay evidence is admissible during the protest  
15 proceeding.” 22.600.3.24(C), (D) NMAC. We therefore reject TRD’s argument that  
16 it was prejudiced by the inability to cross-examine Feliz Martone.

17 {12} TRD asserts Feliz Martone’s affidavit should not have been afforded such  
18 weight because (1) Feliz Martone states in her affidavit that she “believes” certain  
19 things, indicating that she lacks personal knowledge; and (2) Feliz Martone is not a

1 disinterested party due to separate litigation between Taxpayer and the firm. Neither  
2 argument persuades us that the AHO improperly relied on Feliz Martone’s affidavit.

3 {13} First, TRD argues that Feliz Martone lacked personal knowledge of the  
4 information contained in her affidavit because she stated therein that she “‘believes’  
5 certain things.” However, Feliz Martone states only once in her affidavit that “[t]he  
6 audit I was subjected to, *I believe*, involved the exact same issue and circumstances  
7 that [Taxpayer] faces for 2015 through 2018.” Yet the issue on appeal is not whether  
8 Feliz Martone was subject to an audit with the same issue and circumstances as  
9 Taxpayer. Instead, the issues on appeal include whether Taxpayer performed work  
10 for the firm, whether she was an employee thereof, whether she was paid as such  
11 during the relevant period, how she was paid and, in the end, whether she or the firm  
12 were responsible for payment of gross receipts tax based on the income reported on  
13 the SSA 1099s issued to Taxpayer.

14 {14} As to those issues, Feliz Martone states in her affidavit: (1) “[Taxpayer]  
15 performed limited work for the [f]irm in 2015, . . . [Taxpayer] performed no work  
16 for the [f]irm in 2016”; (2) “[a]t all times during her employment with the [f]irm,  
17 [Taxpayer] was a part-time W-2 wage earner. Her only remuneration from the [f]irm  
18 consisted of W-2 wages, except for certain reimbursements from the [f]irm for  
19 expenses such as New Mexico State Bar Association membership dues and  
20 attendance at Continuing Legal Education events”; (3) “[a]t no time did [Taxpayer]



1 have any right to, ownership of, or interest in any fees paid directly by the Social  
2 Security Administration (“SSA”) on behalf of the [firm’s clients”]; (4) “[a]ll client  
3 fees paid directly by the SSA, in the name of [Taxpayer], both during her  
4 employment with the [firm and after her employment with the [firm ended, were  
5 paid into the [firm’s US Bank business checking account”]; (5) “[t]he SSA direct-  
6 paid client fees . . . constitute gross receipts to the [firm as a professional  
7 corporation”]; and (6) “[t]he [firm is solely responsible to pay the New Mexico Gross  
8 Receipts Tax on all client fees paid directly by the SSA on behalf of all the attorneys  
9 named on their Forms 1099-MISC, including all fees paid in the name of [Taxpayer]  
10 and reflected on 1099-MISC forms issued to [Taxpayer] by the SSA.” Contrary to  
11 TRD’s argument, Feliz Martone’s assertions are material facts about which Feliz  
12 Martone had personal knowledge. *See State v. Martinez*, 1986-NMCA-069, ¶ 9, 104  
13 N.M. 584, 725 P.2d 263 (“A witness having personal knowledge of relevant matters  
14 is competent to testify.”).

15 {15} Second, TRD argues that Feliz Martone is interested in the outcome of this  
16 case because of her status as a party in separate litigation between Taxpayer and the  
17 firm, rendering her affidavit unreliable. However, the AHO knew of the pending  
18 litigation between Taxpayer and the firm and, nevertheless, deemed the affidavit  
19 reliable. In this case, “the [AHO] acts as a trier of fact and must ultimately weigh the  
20 testimony, determine the credibility of the witnesses, reconcile inconsistencies, and

1 determine where the truth lies.” *Gemini Las Colinas, LLC*, 2023-NMCA-039, ¶ 17  
2 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). “[W]e neither reweigh the evidence  
3 nor replace the [AHO’s] conclusions with our own.” *Dewitt v. Rent-A-Ctr., Inc.*,  
4 2009-NMSC-032, ¶ 12, 146 N.M. 453, 212 P.3d 341.

5 {16} Finally, in arguing that the AHO “exalted the unsubstantiated statements of  
6 Taxpayer’s witnesses over the content of the documentary evidence to the contrary,”  
7 TRD relies almost entirely on the SSA 1099s. However, the AHO determined the  
8 SSA 1099s were erroneous and “[t]hey wholly fail to accurately report income paid  
9 by SSA to, and received by, [Taxpayer] and cannot reliably form the basis for  
10 taxation under the New Mexico Gross Receipts and Compensating Tax Act because  
11 [Taxpayer] never received this money.”

12 {17} In reaching this conclusion, the AHO logically and convincingly pointed out,  
13 despite TRD’s challenges to Taxpayer’s testimony and evidence, that (1) Section 7-  
14 9-3.5(A)(1), defines “gross receipts” as “the total amount of money or the value of  
15 other consideration received . . . from performing services in New Mexico”; (2)  
16 “[t]he critical term in this case is ‘received’ in that receipts must derive from a  
17 specified activity and actually be *received*”; (3) “the SSA continues to report  
18 substantial amounts of nonemployee compensation to [Taxpayer] even after her  
19 employment with [l]aw [f]irm ended in 2016”; (4) “[Taxpayer] credibly testified that  
20 she had not practiced before the SSA since 2015. Yet, the SSA reports more than

1 \$138,000.00 in nonemployee compensation in the remaining years under the  
2 [a]assessment; years in which [Taxpayer] credibly testified that she neither practiced  
3 nor derived nonemployee or any other compensation from SSA”; (5) “[l]aw [f]irm  
4 has accepted responsibility for payment of [the] gross receipts tax by entering into  
5 an installment agreement”; (6) law firm affirmed that it “is solely responsible to pay  
6 the New Mexico [g]ross [r]eceipts [t]ax on all client fees paid directly by the SSA  
7 on behalf of all the attorneys named on their forms 1099-MISC, including all fees  
8 paid in the name of [Taxpayer] and reflected on 1099-MISC forms issued to  
9 [Taxpayer] by the SSA”; (7) “[w]ith regard for 2015, [Taxpayer] was compensated  
10 as a W-2 employee of [l]aw [f]irm and she had no interest whatsoever in [l]aw [f]irm  
11 or its accounts”; (8) “[TRD’s witness] testified that the 1099-MISC forms form the  
12 basis for the [a]ssessment”; and (9) “[a]lthough . . . the 1099-MISC forms represent  
13 a reasonable starting point in evaluating whether there is a gross receipts tax liability,  
14 the evaluation cannot disregard other reliable, trustworthy, and credible evidence  
15 which substantially diminishes the reliability of . . . the 1099-MISC forms.”

16 {18} We agree with these points, with the conclusions the AHO arrived at based on  
17 them, and conclude that they are based on substantial evidence in the record as a  
18 whole. Again, we will neither reweigh the evidence nor replace the AHO’s  
19 conclusion with our own. *Dewitt v. Rent-A-Ctr., Inc.*, 2009-NMSC-032, ¶ 12. The

1 AHO was permitted to find Taxpayer’s testimony and evidence credible and the SSA  
2 1099s erroneous.

3 {19} We need not address TRD’s remaining arguments alleging various infirmities  
4 with Taxpayer’s documentary evidence. The AHO’s decision was sufficiently  
5 supported by Taxpayer’s testimony standing alone, *see Gemini Las Colinas. LLC*,  
6 2023-NMCA-039, ¶ 37, and certainly by Taxpayer’s testimony in combination with  
7 Feliz Martone’s affidavit.

8 {20} Consequently, we hold that the AHO’s Decision and Order is supported by  
9 substantial evidence and is not arbitrary, capricious, or contrary to law.

10 **CONCLUSION**

11 {21} We affirm the AHO’s Decision and Order.<sup>1</sup>

12 {22} **IT IS SO ORDERED.**


13   
14 **GERALD E. BACA, Judge**

---

<sup>1</sup>Taxpayer requests an award of attorney fees, pursuant to Section 7-1-25(D). As we have upheld the decision of the AHO, Taxpayer may submit a motion for reasonable attorney fees in association therewith. *See* Rule 12-403(B) NMRA (setting forth allowable costs and reasonable attorney fees, which the appellate court may, in its discretion, award to the prevailing party on request); Rule 16-105(A) NMRA (setting forth the factors to be considered in determining the reasonableness of a fee).

1 **WE CONCUR:**

2   
3 **JANE B. YOHALEM, Judge**

4   
5 **KATHERINE A. WRAY, Judge**