BENJAMIN B. WAGNER United States Attorney YOSHINORI H. T. HIMEL #66194 Assistant United States Attorney Eastern District of California 501 I Street, Suite 10-100 Sacramento, CA 95814-2322 Telephone: (916) 554-2760 Facsimile: (916) 554-2900			
		email: yoshinori.himel@usdoj.gov	
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	2:14-cv-02531-JAM-KJN		
Petitioner,	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AND ORDER RE: I.R.S. SUMMMONS		
V.	ENFORCEMENT		
ROBERT BAILEY LITTLE,	Taxpayer: ROBERT BAILEY LITTLE		
	RODERT DAILET LITTLE		
Respondent.			
This matter came on before Magistrate Judge Kendall J. Newman on December 18, 2014,			
under the Order to Show Cause filed November 3, 2014. The order, with the amended verified			
petition filed October 31, 2014, and its supporting memorandum, was personally served at			
Respondent's residence on November 7, 2014. Respondent did not file opposition or non-			
opposition to the verified petition as provided for in the Order to Show Cause. At the hearing,			
Yoshinori H. T. Himel, Assistant United States Attorney, appeared for Petitioner. Investigating			
Revenue Officer Jose Arteaga was present in the courtroom. Respondent appeared at the			
hearing.			
The Amended Verified Petition to Enforce Internal Revenue Summons seeks to enforce			
an administrative summons (Exhibit A to the petition) issued May 30, 2014. The summons is			
part of an investigation of the respondent to secure information relevant to collection of Form			
	United States Attorney YOSHINORI H. T. HIMEL #66194 Assistant United States Attorney Eastern District of California 501 I Street, Suite 10-100 Sacramento, CA 95814-2322 Telephone: (916) 554-2760 Facsimile: (916) 554-2900 email: yoshinori.himel@usdoj.gov Attorneys for Petitioner United States of America IN THE UNITED ST EASTERN DISTI UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Petitioner, v. ROBERT BAILEY LITTLE, Respondent. This matter came on before Magistrate under the Order to Show Cause filed Novemb petition filed October 31, 2014, and its suppo Respondent's residence on November 7, 2014 opposition to the verified petition as provided Yoshinori H. T. Himel, Assistant United Stat Revenue Officer Jose Arteaga was present in hearing. The Amended Verified Petition to Enfa an administrative summons (Exhibit A to the		

1 940 taxes for the calendar years ending December 31, 1999, December 31, 2000, December 31, 2 2001, December 31, 2002, December 31, 2003, December 31, 2004, December 31, 2005, 3 December 31, 2006, December 31, 2007, December 31, 2008, December 31, 2009 and 4 December 31, 2012; Form 941 taxes for the quarterly periods ending March 31, 1999, June 30, 5 1999, September 30, 1999, December 31, 1999, March 31, 2000, June 30, 2000, September 30, 2000, December 31, 2000, March 31, 2001, June 30, 2001, September 20, 2001, December 31, 6 7 2001, March 31, 2002, June 30, 2002, September 30, 2002, December 31, 2002, March 31, 8 2003, June 30, 2003, September 30, 2003, December 31, 2003, March 31, 2004, June 30, 2004, 9 September 30, 2004, December 31, 2004, March 31, 2005, June 30, 2005, September 30, 2005, 10 December 31, 2005, March 31, 2006, June 30, 2006, September 30, 2006, December 31, 2006, 11 March 31, 2007, June 30, 2007, September 30, 2007, December 31, 2007, March 31, 2008, June 12 30, 2008, September 30, 2008, December 31, 2008, March 31, 2009, June 30, 2009, September 13 30, 2009, September 30, 2010, December 31, 2010, September 30, 2011, December 31, 2011, 14 March 31, 2012, June 30, 2012, September 30, 2012, December 31, 2012 and March 31, 2013, 15 and Form CIVPEN taxes for the calendar period ending December 31, 2010. 16 Subject matter jurisdiction is invoked under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1340 and 1345, and is found to 17 be proper. I.R.C. §§ 7402(b) and 7604(a) (26 U.S.C.) authorize the government to bring the 18 action. The Order to Show Cause shifted to respondent the burden of rebutting any of the four 19 requirements of United States v. Powell, 379 U.S. 48, 57-58 (1964).

I have reviewed the petition and documents in support. Based on the uncontroverted petition verified by Revenue Officer Jose Arteaga and the entire record, I find:

(1) The summons issued and served by Revenue Officer Jose Arteaga on May 30, 2014, seeking testimony and production of documents and records in respondent's possession, was issued in good faith and for a legitimate purpose under I.R.C. § 7602, that is, to secure information needed to determine the corrected amounts on Form 940 taxes for the calendar years ending December 31, 1999, December 31, 2000, December 31, 2001, December 31, 2002, December 31, 2003, December 31, 2004, December 31, 2005, December 31, 2006, December 31, 2007, December 31, 2008, December 31, 2009 and December 31, 2012; Form 941 taxes for

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

11 12

14

15

13

16

17 18

19 20

22

21

23 24

26 27

28

25

1999, March 31, 2000, June 30, 2000, September 30, 2000, December 31, 2000, March 31, 2001, June 30, 2001, September 20, 2001, December 31, 2001, March 31, 2002, June 30, 2002, September 30, 2002, December 31, 2002, March 31, 2003, June 30, 2003, September 30, 2003, December 31, 2003, March 31, 2004, June 30, 2004, September 30, 2004, December 31, 2004, March 31, 2005, June 30, 2005, September 30, 2005, December 31, 2005, March 31, 2006, June 30, 2006, September 30, 2006, December 31, 2006, March 31, 2007, June 30, 2007, September 30, 2007, December 31, 2007, March 31, 2008, June 30, 2008, September 30, 2008, December 31, 2008, March 31, 2009, June 30, 2009, September 30, 2009, September 30, 2010, December 31, 2010, September 30, 2011, December 31, 2011, March 31, 2012, June 30, 2012, September

(2) The information sought is relevant to that purpose.

period ending December 31, 2010.

(3) The information sought is not already in the possession of the Internal Revenue Service.

30, 2012, December 31, 2012 and March 31, 2013, and Form CIVPEN taxes for the calendar

- (4) The administrative steps required by the Internal Revenue Code have been followed.
- (5) There is no evidence of referral of this case by the Internal Revenue Service to the Department of Justice for criminal prosecution.
- (6) The verified petition and its exhibits made a prima facie showing of satisfaction of the requirements of United States v. Powell, 379 U.S. 48, 57-58 (1964).
- (7) The burden shifted to respondent, Robert Bailey Little, to rebut that prima facie showing.
 - (8) Respondent presented no argument or evidence to rebut the prima facie showing.
- (9) Respondent agreed with the Revenue Officer, and stated his agreement in open court, to appear and comply with the summons at the I.R.S. offices at 4830 Business Center Drive, Ste. 250, Fairfield, CA 94534, before Revenue Officer Arteaga or his designated representative, on January 15, 2015, 9:00 A.M. He is hereby ORDERED to appear and to comply with the I.R.S. summons then and there.

I therefore recommend that the I.R.S. summons served upon Respondent be enforced; and that Respondent be ordered to appear at the I.R.S. offices at 4830 Business Center Drive, Ste. 250, Fairfield, CA 94534, before Revenue Officer Arteaga or his designated representative, on January 15, 2015, at 9:00 A.M., as agreed to by RO Arteaga and Respondent Little at the show cause hearing. Should the January 15th appearance need to be continued or rescheduled, the rescheduled date is to be set in writing by RO Arteaga. Respondent is to appear before RO Arteaga or his designated representative, then and there to be sworn, to give testimony, and to produce for examining and copying the books, checks, records, papers and other data demanded by the summons, the examination to continue from day to day until completed. I further recommend that if it enforces the summons, the Court retain jurisdiction to enforce its order by its contempt power.

These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within ten (10) days after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Any reply to the objections shall be served on all parties and filed with the court within ten (10) days after service of the objections. The parties are advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Turner v. Duncan, 158 F.3d 449, 455 (9th Cir. 1998); Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153, 1156-57 (9th Cir. 1991).

THE CLERK SHALL SERVE this and further orders by mail to Robert Bailey Little, 125 Sage Sparrow Circle, Vacaville, CA 95637

It is SO ORDERED and RECOMMENDED.

Dated: December 29, 2014

KENDALL J. NEWMAN

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE