1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	No. 1:18-cv-00566-DAD-BAM	
12	Petitioner,		
13	v.	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, ENFORCING	
14	IVAN RAMIREZ,	SUMMONS, AND DIRECTING	
15	Respondent.	RESPONDENT TO APPEAR AT A TIME TO BE SET BY THE INVESTIGATING REVENUE OFFICER	
16		(Doc. No. 9)	
17			
18			
19		led a petition to enforce an internal revenue	
20		nvestigation of respondent Ivan Ramirez seeking to	
21	secure information needed to collect the tax liability for Form 940 for the calendar periods ending		
22	December 31, 2013, December 31, 2014, December 31, 2015, and December 31, 2016 and Form		
23	943 for the calendar periods ending December 31, 2014, December 31, 2015, and December 31,		
24	2016. (Doc. No. 1.) The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28		
25	U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 302.		
26	On May 2, 2018, the assigned magistrate judge issued an order requiring respondent to		
27	appear on June 29, 2018 to show cause why the I.R.S. summons issued to him on May 24, 2017		
28	should not be enforced. (Doc. No. 4.) On May 10, 2018, the United States served respondent		
		1	

1	with the verified petition to enforce the I.R.S. summons (Doc. No. 1), its supporting		
2	memorandum (Doc. No. 3-1), and the order to show cause. (Doc. No. 4.) Respondent did not file		
3	an opposition to the verified petition as required by the order to show cause.		
4	At the show cause hearing on June 29, 2018, Assistant U.S. Attorney John Edwards		
5	appeared on behalf of the petitioner, and investigating revenue officer Lorena Ramos was also		
6	present. (Doc. No. 9 at 1.) Respondent did not appear at the hearing. (Id.) On July 2, 2018, the		
7	assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations, recommending that the I.R.S.		
8	summons issued to respondent be enforced. (Id. at 3.) The findings and recommendations were		
9	served on respondent and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within		
10	fourteen days after service. (Id.) To date, respondent has filed no objections to the findings and		
11	recommendations, and the time in which to do so has passed.		
12	In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the undersigned has		
13	conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court finds		
14	the findings and recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis.		
15	Accordingly,		
16	1. The findings and recommendations issued on July 2, 2018 (Doc. No. 9) are adopted in		
17	full;		
18	2. The I.R.S. summons issued to respondent is hereby enforced;		
19	3. Respondent Ivan Ramirez is ordered to appear at the I.R.S. offices at 2525 Capitol Street,		
20	Suite 206, Fresno, CA 93721, before revenue officer Lorena Ramos or her designated		
21	representative, on or before a date to be set by revenue officer Lorena Ramos in		
22	consultation with respondent Ramirez, then and there to be sworn, to give testimony, and		
23	to produce for examining and copying the books, checks, records, papers, and other data		
24	demanded by the summons, the examination to continue from day to day until completed.		
25	In the event respondent and officer Ramos are unable to agree on a date, an appointment		
26	date shall be set by officer Ramos. Should the appointment date need to be continued or		
27	rescheduled, the respondent is to be notified in writing of the later date for the		
28	appointment by Officer Ramos;		
	2		

1	4. The District Court will retain jurisdiction to enforce its order by means of its contempt	
2	power; and	
3	5. The Clerk of the Court shall serve this and any future orders issued in this action by	
4	mailing them to Ivan Ramirez, 17120	Melba Dr. E, Madera, CA 93638-9603.
5	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
6	Dated: September 6, 2018	Dale A. Drogd
7		UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25 26		
26 27		
27 28		
20		3