1 2 3 4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 6 7 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Case No. C-08-2595 JCS 8 ORDER FOR FURTHER BRIEFING Plaintiff(s), 9 v. 10 RICHARD D. LEE, ET AL., 11 Defendant(s). 12 13 Pending before the Court is a motion for summary judgment filed by Plaintiff United States of 14 America. Oral argument is scheduled for July 23, 2010 at 9:30 a.m. 15 In this action to foreclose on property to satisfy outstanding tax obligations, Plaintiff argues that 16 Defendant taxpayer is not entitled to any offset on the stipulated amount of unpaid tax assessments. 17 Defendant argues that the United States owes him approximately \$750,000 and that any sale of his 18 property should be offset by the amount owed to him by the United States. Plaintiff argues that this 19 "issue is not before this court as the taxpayer has not filed an action against the United States concerning 20 this contractual dispute." United States' Motion for Summary Judgment at 9. The United States cites 21 to no authority in support of this proposition, nor does it address whether a taxpayer may bring an offset 22 claim as an affirmative defense in a foreclosure action. Rather, the United States argues that the court 23 lacks jurisdiction to hear contract claims against the government in amounts exceeding \$10,000. 24 The United States is hereby ORDERED to file a supplemental reply brief on or before June 28, 25 2010, which shall address two issues and be supported be relevant legal authority: 26 (1) Defendant's affirmative defense that he is owed sums by the United States and that these 27 sums should be an offset or reduction in the tax assessment and lien in this case; and 28

(2) Defendant taxpayer's argument that his request for an offset is an equitable remedy, providing jurisdiction in this Court. Defendant may file a response on or before July 2, 2010. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: June 22, 2010 CA JOSEPH C. SPERO United States Magistrate Judge