Summary of New Litigation Received Revenue Legal Counsel, Department of Finance and Administration

Plaintiff: Alert Alarm Systems, Inc. Attorney: Eugene Sayre

Defendant: Richard Weiss, Director of DFA Attorney: Michelle Baker

Court: Sebastian County Circuit Docket #: CV 13-0323

Relief Sought: Reversal of an administrative decision upholding an assessment of sales

and use tax in the approximate amount of \$132,000

Issue: Whether tax is due on the purchase of tangible personal property installed

by the taxpayer in connection with the alarm services it provides

Case History: Complaint filed in March 2013. Answer filed.

Current Status: Case is in discovery stage.

Plaintiff: Lion Oil Company Attorney: Jim Hyden

Defendant: Richard Weiss Attorney: Todd Evans

Court: Union County Circuit Docket #: CV 2013-0021-4

Relief Sought: Reversal of administrative decision upholding an assessment of sales

and use tax

Issue: Whether certain machinery and equipment that the plaintiff uses to

remove sulfur from the fuels it produces in its refining process is exempt from sales and use tax as machinery and equipment used in pollution control (to prevent or reduce air or water pollution that would otherwise

result from the operation of the facility)

Case History: Complaint filed on January 22, 2013; served on DFA May 17, 2012

Current Status: Extension to file answer until after current audit is completed.

Status of Previously Reported Litigation Revenue Legal Counsel, Department of Finance and Administration

Plaintiff: Theresa Holbrook Attorney: James A. Streett

Defendant: Healthport, Inc. Attorney: B. J. Walker

Richard Weiss Attorney: Joel DiPippa

Court: Pope County Circuit Docket #: CV 20-10-588

Relief Sought: Declaratory judgment regarding whether sales tax is due on the charge to

a patient for copying and providing paper copies of medical records in

preparation for, or in connection with, litigation

Issue: Whether the charge for medical records is subject to sales tax as the sale

of tangible personal property

Case History: Complaint originally filed by Holbrook against Healthport alleging that

Healthport illegally collected sales tax on the sales of medical records. Healthport filed a third party complaint against DFA for a declaratory judgment on the issue of the taxability of the sales of the records. Holbrook then amended her complaint to plead a claim for illegal exaction against DFA. DFA filed a motion to dismiss. Holbrook dismissed the claim for illegal exaction, leaving only the declaratory judgment pending against DFA. The circuit ruled held that the charge for the medical

records is subject to sales tax. The plaintiff appealed.

Current Status: The Arkansas Supreme Court issued a decision on February 12, 2013

holding that the trial court's Rule 54(b) certificate did not comply with the requirements of the rule in order to appeal the legal issue. The dismissal was without prejudice and another order has been signed by the trial

court from which the plaintiff will submit a subsequent appeal.