1 BENJAMIN B. WAGNER United States Attorney YOSHINORI H. T. HIMEL #66194 2 United States Courthouse 3 501 I Street, Suite 10-100 Sacramento, California 95814 Telephone: (916) 554-2760 4 DEC 17 28 Facsimile: (916) 554-2900 5 Attorneys for Petitioner, United States of America 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 10 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 1:11-cv-01250-AWI-SMS 11 12 Petitioner, [PROPOSED] ORDER FINDING RESPONDENT IN CIVIL CONTEMPT 13 OF ORDER FILED NOVEMBER 15, 2012 v. 14 AND JANUARY 16, 2012 ORDET NATHAN D. BACON, 15 16 Respondent. 17 18 This matter came before me on December 17, 2012, under the Contempt Order to Show 19 20 Cause filed November 15, 2012. Assistant United States Attorney Glen F. Dorgan and 21 investigating Revenue Officer Michael F. Nicholas were present. Respondent did not file opposition to contempt and did not appear at the show-cause hearing. Based upon the entire 22 record and the oral proceedings, I make the following findings: 23 24 (1) On July 29, 2011, Petitioner filed a Petition to enforce an IRS summons issued January 7, 2011, directed to the respondent, Nathan D. Bacon, and seeking testimony, books, 25 26 records, papers, and other data to aid RO Nicholas' investigation to determine financial information relevant to the IRS's efforts to determine personal income tax liabilities for the tax 27 28

[PROPOSED] ORDER FINDING RESPONDENT IN CIVIL CONTEMPT OF ORDER FILED

**NOVEMBER 15, 2012** 

1

years ending December 31, 2004, December 31, 2005, December 31, 2006, December 31, 2007, and December 31, 2009.

- (2) By Order filed January 18, 2012, I enforced the IRS summons and ordered respondent to meet with the investigating Revenue Officer within 21 days after issuance of the Order, or at a later date to be set by the Revenue Officer, and to produce all testimony, books, records, and other data demanded by the IRS summons issued January 7, 2011.
- (3) On January 19, 2012, the Revenue Officer wrote the respondent setting the compliance date for February 15, 2012, at 9:00 a.m., at the Modesto I.R.S.
- (4) The respondent did not appear, and he failed to provide the testimony and documents demanded in the enforced summons.
- (5) On April 12, 2012, government counsel mailed a letter to respondent reminding him of the need to provide the required documentation to comply with the summons enforcement order. The letter set a compliance appointment for May 4, 2012, and warned of a contempt petition if respondent did not comply.
- (6) The respondent again did not appear, and he failed to provide the testimony and documents demanded in the enforced summons.
- (7) On November 5, 2012, Petitioner filed a Petition Re: Contempt of Order Filed January 18, 2012. This Court's Order, filed November 15, 2012, required the respondent to appear before this Court on December 17, 2012, at 1:30 p.m., and show cause as to why he should not be held in contempt for failure to comply with the Order filed January 18, 2012. This order further set a date certain for a written response by the respondent. This order was duly served by mail upon the respondent.
- (8) Respondent failed to file written response, and failed to appear at the hearing.
- (9) Respondent's failure to comply with the Order filed January 18, 2012, continues to the present.

"A court has the inherent power to punish for civil or criminal contempt any obstruction of justice relating to any judicial proceeding." Lambert v. Montana, 545 F.2d 87, 88 (9th Cir. 1976). Petitioner has the burden of proving its prima facie case by clear and convincing proof. Balla v. Idaho State Bd. Of Corrs., 869 F.2d 461, 466 (9th Cir. By the Petition for Contempt and supporting documents, including the

Respondent, NATHAN D. BACON, is in civil contempt of this Court for his failure to comply with the Order filed on January 18, 2012, directing

Respondent to comply with the IRS Summons issued on January 7, 2011.

A Bench Warrant for the arrest of Respondent, NATHAN D. BACON, will

After arrest, Respondent, NATHAN D. BACON, is to be incarcerated until he complies with the Order filed January 18, 2012, and shall be brought the undersished for further proceedings according

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE