

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SUPREME COURT

APPEAL FROM THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT
Ralph King Anderson, III, Chief Administrative Law Judge

Supreme Court Appellate Case No. 2024-000625

Appellate Case No. 2019-001706

Trial Court Case No. 17-ALJ-17-0238-CC

Amazon Services, LLCPetitioner,

v.

South Carolina Department of RevenueRespondent.

**BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, BUSINESS
ROUNDTABLE, NETCHOICE, THE SOUTH CAROLINA
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, AND THE GREATER COLUMBIA
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

Erik R. Zimmerman
(admitted pro hac vice)
ROBINSON, BRADSHAW & HINSON, P.A.
1450 Raleigh Road, Suite 100
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27517
(919) 328-8800
ezimmerman@robinsonbradshaw.com

Stephen M. Cox
S.C. Bar No. 12263
ROBINSON, BRADSHAW & HINSON, P.A.
202 E. Main Street, Suite 201
Rock Hill, South Carolina 29730
(803) 325-2900
scox@robinsonbradshaw.com

Attorneys for Amici Curiae

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW.....	1
INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE.....	1
SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT	3
ARGUMENT	4
I. The predictability of the tax laws is vital to the business community and to the South Carolina economy as a whole	4
II. The established rule that ambiguity must be resolved in the taxpayer’s favor supports a predictable tax system	7
III. The decision below impairs the predictability of the tax laws by undermining the rule that ambiguity is resolved in the taxpayer’s favor.....	9
CONCLUSION.....	14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Alltel Commc'ns, Inc. v. S.C. Dep't of Revenue</i> , 399 S.C. 313, 731 S.E.2d 869 (2012).....	7, 8, 10
<i>Columbia Ry., Gas & Elec. Co. v. Carter</i> , 127 S.C. 473, 121 S.E. 377 (1924).....	7
<i>Cooper River Bridge, Inc. v. S.C. Tax Comm'n</i> , 182 S.C. 72, 188 S.E. 508 (1936).....	7, 8
<i>Fuller v. S.C. Tax Comm'n</i> , 128 S.C. 14, 121 S.E. 478 (1924).....	8
<i>Gould v. Gould</i> , 245 U.S. 151 (1917).....	7
<i>Hadden v. S.C. Tax Comm'n</i> , 183 S.C. 38, 190 S.E. 249 (1937).....	7
<i>Kennedy v. S.C. Ret. Sys.</i> , 345 S.C. 339, 549 S.E.2d 243 (2001).....	11
<i>Mid-S. Mgmt. Co. v. Sherwood Dev. Corp.</i> , 374 S.C. 588, 649 S.E.2d 135 (Ct. App. 2007).....	12
<i>S.C. Nat'l Bank v. S.C. Tax Comm'n</i> , 297 S.C. 279, 376 S.E.2d 512 (1989).....	7
<i>Travelscape, LLC v. S.C. Dep't of Revenue</i> , 391 S.C. 89, 705 S.E.2d 28 (2011).....	10
<i>United States v. Generes</i> , 405 U.S. 93 (1972).....	4

Other Authorities

Laura Alix, Am. Banker, <i>Rising Compliance Costs are Hurting Customers, Banks Say</i> (Apr. 12, 2018).....	6
--	---

Ass'n of Int'l Certified Pro. Accts., <i>Tax Policy Concept Statement 1, Guiding principles of good tax policy: A framework for evaluating tax proposals</i> (2017).....	4
Steven J. Davis et al., Am. Enter. Inst., <i>Business Class: Policy Uncertainty Is Choking Recovery</i> (Oct. 6, 2011).....	5
THE FEDERALIST NO. 62 (Jacob E. Cooke ed., 1961).....	5
Jason J. Fichtner & Jacob M. Feldman, Mercatus Ctr., <i>The Hidden Costs of Tax Compliance</i> (2013)	6
Leigh Osofsky, <i>The Case Against Strategic Tax Law Uncertainty</i> , 64 Tax L. Rev. 489 (2011).....	6
Antonin Scalia & Bryan A. Garner, <i>Reading Law: The Interpretation of Legal Texts</i> (2012)	8
Shambie Singer, <i>Sutherland Statutes and Statutory Construction</i> (8th ed., Nov. 2024 update).....	7
U.S. Dep't of the Treasury, <i>Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill Statement on Treasury's Plan to Combat Abusive Tax Avoidance Transactions</i> (Mar. 20, 2002)	6

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

- I. Did the Court of Appeals err in reading this Court's decision in *Travelscape* to require a broad interpretation of a tax statute, contrary to this Court's longstanding rule favoring a taxpayer's reasonable interpretation?
- II. Did the Court of Appeals err in finding the statute "unambiguous" without properly considering Amazon Services' contrary and reasonable interpretation?
- III. Did the Court of Appeals err in finding no due process violation when it is undisputed that Amazon Services is the only marketplace facilitator being held liable for sales tax on third-party sales under the pre-2019 version of the Sales and Use Tax Act?

INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America ("U.S. Chamber") is the world's largest business federation. It represents approximately 300,000 direct members and indirectly represents the interests of more than three million companies and professional organizations of every size, in every industry sector, and from every region of the country. An important function of the U.S. Chamber is to represent the interests of its members before Congress, the Executive Branch, and the courts. To that end, the U.S. Chamber regularly files amicus briefs in cases, like this one, that raise issues of concern to the nation's business community.

Business Roundtable is an association of chief executive officers of America's leading companies representing every sector of the U.S. economy and with employees in every state. Business Roundtable works to promote a thriving United States economy and economic opportunity for all Americans by advocating for sound public policies.

NetChoice is a national trade association of online businesses that works to protect free expression and promote free enterprise on the internet. Toward those ends, NetChoice is engaged in litigation, amicus curiae work, and political advocacy. At both the federal and state levels, NetChoice fights to ensure the internet stays innovative and free.

The South Carolina Chamber of Commerce (“State Chamber”) is a not-for-profit, statewide organization with a mission of serving as the leading voice for business in South Carolina and a vision of making South Carolina’s economy the most vibrant in the United States, creating opportunity and prosperity for all. The State Chamber’s membership is comprised of businesses from across the state and across industries, from startups and family-owned businesses to multi-national enterprises—all of whom call South Carolina home. The State Chamber aims to protect the interests of South Carolina’s business community by identifying and addressing issues that may impair economic development and growth, and routinely participates in state and federal litigation as an amicus.

The Greater Columbia Chamber of Commerce (“Columbia Chamber”) has, since 1902, been a trusted resource for businesses and their employees. Its members rely on the Columbia Chamber’s assistance in navigating complex issues facing the business community. Through public policy and advocacy, the Columbia Chamber provides a unified voice for the regional business community, in order to create and promote a stronger community for businesses and for residents and an environment where businesses can flourish.

Amici have a strong interest in ensuring that the business community can predict its tax obligations in advance. The decision below undermines that interest. The Court of Appeals weakened the established rule that doubts on the meaning of tax statutes are resolved in the taxpayer's favor. Ensuring that courts follow that rule and preserve the predictability of the tax laws has great importance for amici and their members, in South Carolina and nationally.

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT

The predictability of the tax laws is essential to the business community and the economy as a whole. Businesses need their tax obligations to be predictable so that they can invest for the future and plan for compliance. Prospectively, when tax obligations are unpredictable, it is difficult for businesses to make the investments that are needed to spark economic growth and innovation. Retrospectively, a lack of predictability leads to unexpected tax bills that disrupt companies' operations and can even drive them out of business, especially when those companies are small. These harms to the business community produce downstream harms to everyone in the form of slower growth, higher prices, lower wages, and fewer jobs.

An important tool exists for avoiding these harms: the time-honored rule that doubts on the meaning of tax statutes are construed in favor of the taxpayer. For more than a century, this pro-taxpayer rule has helped businesses in South Carolina and beyond to predict their tax obligations with confidence.

The predictability of the tax laws is now under threat from the decision of the Court of Appeals in this case. That decision departed from this Court's precedent

by diluting the rule that ambiguities in tax statutes are resolved in the taxpayer's favor. If left uncorrected, the Court of Appeals' new approach to the interpretation of tax statutes would impair the predictability of the tax laws and inflict serious harm on the South Carolina business community and its overall economy.

To prevent those harms, this Court should reverse the decision below.

ARGUMENT

I. The predictability of the tax laws is vital to the business community and to the South Carolina economy as a whole.

In tax law, "certainty is desirable." *United States v. Generes*, 405 U.S. 93, 105 (1972). Indeed, a core principle of tax policy is that "[t]ax rules should be clear and simple to understand so that taxpayers can anticipate the tax consequences in advance of a transaction." Ass'n of Int'l Certified Pro. Accts., *Tax Policy Concept Statement 1, Guiding principles of good tax policy: A framework for evaluating tax proposals* 4 (2017), <https://bit.ly/4b1uZ72>.

This need for predictability in the tax laws is especially important for the business community. Businesses are constantly planning for the future. They must decide on a regular basis, for example, whether to hire more workers, whether to expand their operations into new geographic areas, and how to invest their capital. When businesses make those decisions, they need to account for their future tax obligations. Thus, to adopt successful business strategies and to make effective investments, businesses must be able to predict their tax obligations with accuracy.

A lack of predictability in the tax laws, in contrast, harms both the business community and the overall economy.

As a prospective matter, an unpredictable tax environment makes it difficult for businesses to plan and invest. “When businesses are uncertain about taxes,” they “adopt a cautious stance” because “it is costly to make a hiring or investment mistake.” Steven J. Davis et al., Am. Enter. Inst., *Business Class: Policy Uncertainty Is Choking Recovery* (Oct. 6, 2011), <https://bit.ly/4bmfG8K>. This caution inhibits investment and “undermine[s] longer-run growth.” *Id.* As James Madison put the point long ago, “[w]hat prudent merchant will hazard his fortunes in any new branch of commerce, when he knows not but that his plans may be rendered unlawful before they can be executed?” THE FEDERALIST NO. 62, at 421 (James Madison) (Jacob E. Cooke ed., 1961).

Unpredictability also imposes retrospective harms. Unexpected tax bills disrupt businesses’ operations and disturb existing investments. These unexpected costs can even drive small companies out of business altogether. The resulting disruptions hurt not just the taxpaying businesses, but the businesses they partner with, the consumers they serve, and the workers they employ.

Unpredictability in tax laws also harms businesses and the economy by increasing the transaction costs of compliance. When tax obligations are unclear, businesses must hire lawyers and accountants to navigate the uncertainty, creating a deadweight economic loss. The size of this loss is significant: The nationwide costs of tax compliance are hundreds of billions of dollars each year, an amount that

exceeds the combined profits of the country's 25 largest corporations. Jason J. Fichtner & Jacob M. Feldman, Mercatus Ctr., *The Hidden Costs of Tax Compliance* 9 (2013), <https://bit.ly/4aXhtRT>. These compliance costs “add[] to the price of every product, but they do nothing to make our factories more efficient, our computers faster or our cars more durable.” U.S. Dep’t of the Treasury, *Treasury Secretary Paul O’Neill Statement on Treasury’s Plan to Combat Abusive Tax Avoidance Transactions* (Mar. 20, 2002), <https://bit.ly/4bnFW2P>. As a result, compliance costs “raise prices and curtail innovation.” Laura Alix, Am. Banker, *Rising Compliance Costs are Hurting Customers, Banks Say* (Apr. 12, 2018), <https://bloom.bg/4b0xmHt>.

When faced with uncertainty, businesses also might try to avoid audits and unexpected tax liabilities by paying more in taxes than they actually owe. See Leigh Osofsky, *The Case Against Strategic Tax Law Uncertainty*, 64 Tax L. Rev. 489, 499-501 (2011) (describing risk-aversion models that predict this type of over-reporting of tax burdens). These overpayments also prevent businesses from making beneficial investments and pursuing profitable endeavors.

In sum, unpredictability in the tax laws inflicts significant harms on the business community and the economy. Businesses cannot reliably plan and invest for the future, and they face unexpected tax bills and unnecessary compliance costs. Consumers and employees, in turn, suffer the consequences through slower growth, higher prices, lower wages, and lost jobs. To avoid these harms, and to produce a vibrant business climate that fosters economic growth, it is important to ensure that businesses can confidently predict their tax obligations in advance.

II. The established rule that ambiguity must be resolved in the taxpayer’s favor supports a predictable tax system.

Businesses depend on a time-honored rule of tax law to help provide the predictability that they need: Doubts on the meaning of tax statutes are resolved in favor of the taxpayer.

This rule has been woven into the fabric of tax law for more than a century. In 1917, the U.S. Supreme Court held that “[i]n case of doubt,” tax statutes “are construed most strongly against the government, and in favor of the citizen.” *Gould v. Gould*, 245 U.S. 151, 153 (1917). The courts of nearly every state have since embraced this same rule. See 3A Shambie Singer, *Sutherland Statutes and Statutory Construction* § 66:1 n.2 (8th ed., Nov. 2024 update) (citing decisions from 47 states and the District of Columbia).

This Court is no exception. In fact, this Court helped to pioneer the rule that ambiguities in tax statutes are construed in the taxpayer’s favor. In 1924, this Court recognized that it was already an “established rule” under South Carolina law that “substantial doubt” on the scope of a tax statute “must be resolved against the government.” *Columbia Ry., Gas & Elec. Co. v. Carter*, 127 S.C. 473, 482, 121 S.E. 377, 380 (1924). In the century since, the Court has reaffirmed its commitment to this rule multiple times, including most recently in *Alltel Communications, Inc. v. South Carolina Department of Revenue*. See 399 S.C. 313, 321, 731 S.E.2d 869, 873 (2012); see also *S.C. Nat’l Bank v. S.C. Tax Comm’n*, 297 S.C. 279, 281, 376 S.E.2d 512, 513 (1989); *Hadden v. S.C. Tax Comm’n*, 183 S.C. 38, 46-47, 190 S.E. 249, 253 (1937); *Cooper River Bridge, Inc. v. S.C. Tax Comm’n*, 182 S.C. 72, 188 S.E. 508,

509-11 (1936); *Fuller v. S.C. Tax Comm'n*, 128 S.C. 14, 21-22, 121 S.E. 478, 481 (1924).

The bedrock rule that doubts on the meaning of tax statutes are construed to favor the taxpayer helps to provide the predictability that the business community needs. It does so in multiple ways.

First, this rule allows businesses to interpret tax statutes with confidence. The pro-taxpayer rule means that if a tax statute “is ambiguous or is reasonably susceptible of an interpretation that will exclude” a person, “then the person will be excluded.” *Alltel*, 399 S.C. at 321, 731 S.E.2d at 873 (quoting *Cooper River Bridge*, 182 S.C. at 76, 188 S.E. at 509-10). As a result, businesses can predict with certainty that unless a tax statute unambiguously covers a particular business activity, the statute will not apply to that activity.

Second, the pro-taxpayer rule encourages the legislature to speak clearly in tax statutes. The rule does so by making the legislature aware that if it does not speak clearly, its statutes will be construed against the government, and tax revenues will decrease. *Cf.* Antonin Scalia & Bryan A. Garner, *Reading Law: The Interpretation of Legal Texts* 301 (2012) (“The less the courts insist on precision, the less the legislatures will take the trouble to provide it.”). And when the legislature speaks clearly in tax statutes, those statutes provide the certainty and predictability that businesses need.

Third, the pro-taxpayer rule guards against attempts by the government to enforce new tax obligations in a retroactive, unfair way. When the government

retroactively imposes unexpected tax obligations, it destroys the predictability that is so important to the business community. As Amazon Services notes in its brief, retroactive enforcement also deprives taxpayers of fair notice of their tax obligations, and thus violates the constitutional guarantee of due process. *See* Amazon Br. 43-45. Construing ambiguities in tax statutes to favor the taxpayer helps to avoid that constitutional problem and to preserve predictability. It does so by limiting the ability of tax officials to read new obligations into old statutes in enforcement actions.

In sum, this Court and other courts across the country have long helped to give the business community the predictability that it needs by following the rule that doubts on the meaning of tax statutes are construed to favor the taxpayer.

III. The decision below impairs the predictability of the tax laws by undermining the rule that ambiguity is resolved in the taxpayer’s favor.

The decision of the Court of Appeals in this case threatens to sap the tax laws of their predictability. It does so by weakening the rule that doubts on the meaning of tax statutes are resolved in the taxpayer’s favor.

The Court of Appeals paid mere lip service to the pro-taxpayer rule. *See* App. 2114-15. In substance, the court’s analysis clashes with that rule in two important ways.

First, the Court of Appeals held that tax statutes should be construed “broadly.” App. 2118. When tax statutes are construed broadly, doubts are

construed to favor the government, not the taxpayer. The approach adopted by the Court of Appeals is thus the polar opposite of the rule that it purported to apply.

The Court of Appeals tried to find support for its view that tax statutes should be construed broadly in *Travelscape, LLC v. South Carolina Department of Revenue*, 391 S.C. 89, 705 S.E.2d 28 (2011). *See* App. 2118. In *Travelscape*, however, this Court did not hold that tax statutes should be construed broadly. As Amazon Services points out, the words “broad” and “broadly” do not even appear in this Court’s opinion. Amazon Br. 26. Rather than construe a tax statute broadly, this Court held that the “plain language” of the statute in *Travelscape* applied to the activity at issue. 391 S.C. at 98, 705 S.E.2d at 33. Thus, in *Travelscape*, this Court held that *there was no doubt* about the meaning of the statute, not that unclear statutes should be construed broadly to favor the government.

Moreover, one year after *Travelscape*, this Court reaffirmed in *Alltel* that doubts on the meaning of tax statutes are resolved in the taxpayer’s favor. *See* 399 S.C. at 321, 731 S.E.2d at 873. This reaffirmation of the pro-taxpayer rule confirms that *Travelscape* did not replace that rule with a pro-government one.

The second way that the Court of Appeals’ analysis clashes with the pro-taxpayer rule is that the court jumped too quickly to the conclusion that, in this case, there is no statutory doubt to be resolved in Amazon Services’ favor. If the court’s approach were replicated in other cases, the meaning of tax statutes would almost never be viewed as subject to doubt, and the rule that doubts should be construed to favor the taxpayer would be a dead letter.

This problem flows from multiple parts of the decision below.

For example, the Court of Appeals reasoned that the statute at issue here is unambiguous because the statute includes definitions of the relevant statutory terms. App. 2115. As this Court has held, however, statutory definitions can themselves be ambiguous. *See Kennedy v. S.C. Ret. Sys.*, 345 S.C. 339, 344-46, 549 S.E.2d 243, 245-46 (2001). Thus, the mere presence of definitions does not make a statute unambiguous. Under the Court of Appeals' contrary approach, because statutory definitions are so prevalent, the pro-taxpayer rule would seldom apply.

The court also concluded that the statute here is unambiguous without engaging with Amazon Services' interpretation of the statute. *See Amazon Br. 28, 32-34.* To decide whether a statute is ambiguous, however, a court must consider the range of potential interpretations of the statute. If a court can instead disregard the taxpayer's interpretation, the court will rarely find ambiguity, and thus rarely apply the pro-taxpayer rule.

The court also reasoned that, because it deemed the statute to be unambiguous as of 2016 (the relevant tax year in this case), it need not consider that the legislature amended the statute in 2019 to cover the exact activity at issue. *See App. 2116.* But the fact that the legislature saw the need to amend the statute to cover this activity is itself compelling evidence that the 2016 version of the statute was ambiguous. If courts can deem a statute unambiguous without considering indicators that the statute is ambiguous, that too will stack the deck in favor of the government.

The court likewise reasoned that, because it deemed the statute unambiguous, it was irrelevant that the Department of Revenue *told* the legislature that the statute’s application to the activity here was subject to doubt. *See App.* 2115-16; *see also* Amazon Br. 18, 37-38. Here as well, the court erroneously leapt to the conclusion that the statute was unambiguous without considering powerful evidence to the contrary. When the Department of Revenue states that tax statutes are ambiguous, those statements should be treated as highly probative, not as irrelevant.

Finally, the court erroneously disregarded Amazon Services’ showing that courts in other states with similar tax statutes have uniformly concluded that those statutes do not cover the type of activity at issue here. *See App.* 2121; *see also* Amazon Br. 39-42. This uniform body of law is also strong evidence that South Carolina’s statute does not unambiguously favor the government in this case. Yet the Court of Appeals gave no weight to these decisions from other states.*

* The Court of Appeals also mistakenly overrode another important rule that helps to ensure the predictable application of tax laws: the rule that courts are “generally reluctant” to disregard the corporate form, and that they will do so only to prevent “injustice or fundamental unfairness.” *Mid-S. Mgmt. Co. v. Sherwood Dev. Corp.*, 374 S.C. 588, 597-98, 649 S.E.2d 135, 140-41 (Ct. App. 2007). Here, the Court of Appeals showed no reluctance to disregard the corporate separateness of Amazon Services and Amazon Payments. The court collapsed those separate entities into a single one, not to prevent injustice or fundamental unfairness, but merely because an Amazon Services contract used the term “we” to refer to both entities. *See App.* 2117. As Amazon Services notes, that error does not ultimately affect the outcome of this case. *See* Amazon Br. 32-33. But the Court of Appeals’ decision to disregard the corporate form on such weak grounds is another illustration of the court’s inattention to the importance of the predictable application of the tax laws.

For these reasons, under the approach taken by the Court of Appeals, courts would incorrectly conclude that tax statutes unambiguously favor the government far too often. That would leave toothless the rule that ambiguities in tax statutes should be construed in the taxpayer's favor.

Weakening the pro-taxpayer rule in this way would have consequences that extend far beyond this case. As discussed above, rigorous adherence to the pro-taxpayer rule helps to provide the predictability that the business community needs. *See supra* pp. 8-9. By diluting that rule, the decision below would produce the many harms that flow from a lack of predictability in the tax laws. *See supra* pp. 4-6. Those harms would be inflicted not just on Amazon Services, but on the entire South Carolina business community, including the many small businesses that operate here. Small and large businesses alike would need to think twice about making investments in South Carolina, and many might choose to move their operations to states that provide a more predictable tax environment. The brunt of these effects would ultimately be borne by the State's consumers and employees through higher prices, lower wages, and lost jobs.

To prevent those harms and to reaffirm this State's longstanding commitment to the predictable application of the tax laws, this Court should reverse the decision below.

CONCLUSION

Amici ask that this Court reverse the decision of the Court of Appeals.

s/ Stephen M. Cox

Stephen M. Cox

S.C. Bar No. 12263

ROBINSON, BRADSHAW & HINSON, P.A.

202 E. Main Street, Suite 201

Rock Hill, South Carolina 29730

(803) 325-2900

scox@robinsonbradshaw.com

s/ Erik R. Zimmerman

Erik R. Zimmerman

(admitted pro hac vice)

ROBINSON, BRADSHAW & HINSON, P.A.

1450 Raleigh Road, Suite 100

Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27517

(919) 328-8800

ezimmerman@robinsonbradshaw.com

Dated: November 19, 2024

Attorneys for Amici Curiae