State of California Board of Equalization

Memorandum

435.0130

To:	X	Date:	October 20, 1970
From:	Gary J. Jugum		
Subject:	X		
	At the meeting held with X on October 14, 1970 in regard to platinum catalysts, we were asked to look into the question of the application of the tax to certain related		
	matters involving X	n or the	tax to certain related
	We understand that the X located in X		California is
	engaged in the manufacture of sapphire and emerald crystals. The	X	plant
	utilizes both platinum and iridium metal in the manufacture of the crystals.		
	<u>Iridium</u> . Iridium metal is purchased from X fabricated into crucibles by X and is then shippe		
	crucibles are used as a container for molten sapphire in the plant's	growth	operation. Some of
	the iridium metal becomes incorporated into the grown sapphire or to become a component part of the crystal, but a minute portion do	•	
	considerably less than one-half of one percent (1/2 of 1%). Appro	ximately	90 percent of the
	iridium metal is normally recovered and is returned to the taxpayer	r's pool	account with X
	Taxpayer has been paying California state and local use tax on purchases of iridium. Tax has also been paid on fabrication charges made by X		
	however, on the charge for reclaiming iridium from returned crucil	bles.	
	In our opinion, these transactions may be handled on the "r		C
	our memorandum of August 26, 1970, in regard to "platinum used properly due, however, on the charge made to taxpayer by X	•	
	the iridium from crucibles returned to X by taxp	ayer. T	his is in accordance
	with our position in regard to charges made for the recovery of the platinum catalyst. [See page 10 of the memorandum of August 26		
	letter of August 16, 1966, to X on the subject of		
	platinum catalyst from alumina beads.		

<u>Platinum</u> . Taxpayer also purchases platinum from X for use at its X
, California location. The platinum is fabricated X into a
liner, which is then shipped to the X plant. The liner is used in the X
plant's emerald growth reactors. The platinum does not become a component part of
the end product. Taxpayer maintains a platinum pool account with X
California state and local use tax is paid on purchases of platinum. The fabrication charges by
X are also regarded by taxpayer as being subject to the California use tax.
Taxpayer has not been paying tax, however, on the "reclaiming charge" made by X
In our opinion, the "net exchange" principle referred to above is equally applicable in this
case; that is, tax is due basically on the fabrication charge and not on the value of the returned
platinum. Again, however, tax is properly applicable to the "reclaiming charge" made by X

GJJ:ab