	Case 2:19-cv-01539-JCC Docur	ment 34	Filed 05/11/20	Page 1 of 5	
1			Honorat	ole John C. Coughenour	
2 3					
4					
5					
6 7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE				
8 9	CHARLES G. MOORE AND KATHLEEN I MOORE,	/	ase No. 2:19-cv-1	539-JCC	
10	Plaintiffs, v.		INITED STATES	' RULE 56(d)	
11	v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Defendant.	,	OTE ON MOTION CALENDAR: ay 29, 2020		
12 13) IV))	lay 29, 2020		
14	In an abundance of caution, in the event that the Court denies the United States' motion				
15	to dismiss (Dkt. No. 26), the United States moves under Rule 56(d) for (1) additional time to take				
16	discovery and supplement its opposition to Charles and Kathleen Moore's (the "Moores")				
17	motion for summary judgment (Dkt. No. 29) before the Court rules on the motion, and (2) an				
18	order deferring consideration of the Moores' summary judgment motion until after the close of				
19	discovery in this case. If, instead, the Court grants the United States' motion to dismiss (which it				
20	should), then discovery will not be needed and this Rule 56(d) request will be moot.				
21	LEGAL STANDARD				
22	Under Rule 56(d), if the nonmoving party "shows by affidavit or declaration that, for				
23	specified reasons, it cannot present facts essential to justify its opposition, the court may: (1)				
24	U.S. Rule 56(d) Motion 1 (Case No. 2:19-cv-1539-JCC)			D.C. 20044	

Case 2:19-cv-01539-JCC Document 34 Filed 05/11/20 Page 2 of 5

defer considering the motion or deny it; (2) allow time to obtain affidavits or declarations or to 2 take discovery; or (3) issue any other appropriate order." Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(d). "To prevail under 3 this Rule, parties opposing a motion for summary judgment must make (a) a timely application 4 which (b) specifically identifies (c) relevant information, (d) where there is some basis for 5 believing that the information sought actually exists." Employers Teamsters Local Nos. 175 & 6 505 Pension Trust Fund v. Clorox Co., 353 F.3d 1125, 1129 (9th Cir. 2004) (internal quotation 7 marks omitted).

8 Rule 56(d) "provides a device for litigants to avoid summary judgment when they have 9 not had sufficient time to develop affirmative evidence." United States v. Kitsap Physicians 10 Serv., 314 F.3d 995, 1000 (9th Cir. 2002). The Ninth Circuit has held a Rule 56(d) continuance "should be granted almost as a matter of course unless the non-moving party has not diligently 11 12 pursued discovery of the evidence." Burlington N. Santa Fe R.R. Co. v. Assiniboine & Sioux 13 Tribes of Fort Peck Reservation, 323 F.3d 767, 773–74 (9th Cir. 2003) (internal quotation marks 14 and citations omitted).

ARGUMENT

16 Because 26 U.S.C. § 965 is constitutional, the United States should prevail on its motion 17 to dismiss (Dkt. No. 26), and the Moores' cross-motion for summary judgment (Dkt. No. 29) 18 should be denied. However, to ensure it preserves all arguments, the United States is making a Rule 56(d) request in the alternative, should the Court deny the motion to dismiss or the Moores 19 20 otherwise prevail on their constitutional challenge to 26 U.S.C. § 965 (see Dkt. Nos. 1, 29). If this alternative scenario arises, the United States will need additional time to take discovery 22 before it can present facts essential to justify its opposition to the Moores' motion for summary 23 judgment. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(d).

U.S. Rule 56(d) Motion (Case No. 2:19-cv-1539-JCC)

1

15

21

24

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE Tax Division, Western Region P.O. Box 683 Washington, D.C. 20044 Telephone: 202-307-6547

Case 2:19-cv-01539-JCC Document 34 Filed 05/11/20 Page 3 of 5

As part of its defense in this case, the United States is entitled to examine the Moores' 2017 returns, to redetermine their 2017 tax liability, and to raise any offsets (*i.e.*, under-assessed liabilities, improper deductions or credits, or other erroneous items) that could reduce or eliminate any overpayment. *Lewis v. Reynolds*, 284 U.S. 281, 283 (1932); *Cashman v. United States*, 931 F.2d 896 (Table), 1991 WL 67902, at *1–2 (9th Cir. 1991). This is because the Moores bear the burden of proving the amount they are entitled to recover: they must show they actually overpaid their taxes, not just that the tax assessment was erroneous in some respects. *United States v. Janis*, 428 U.S. 433, 440 (1976); *Lewis*, 284 U.S. at 283.

9 The United States has made a timely request under Rule 56(d). The Moores filed a very
10 early summary judgment motion, before discovery even began. *See, e.g., Atigeo LLC v. Offshore*11 *Ltd. D*, No. C13-1694JLR, 2014 WL 1494062, at *3–4 (W.D. Wash. Apr. 16, 2014) (granting
12 Rule 56(d) request made during "early stages" of litigation). There can be no question that the
13 United States has diligently pursued discovery of the evidence. *Burlington N. Santa Fe R.R. Co.*,
14 323 F.3d at 773–74. It has had no opportunity to conduct discovery in the first place.

15 The United States supports its Rule 56(d) request with a declaration from undersigned 16 counsel. Declaration of Jennifer Y. Golden ("Golden Decl.") (attached hereto). The declaration 17 specifically identifies relevant information that can be obtained from the Moores and their CPA 18 through written discovery and depositions. Golden Decl., ¶¶ 3-9. In particular, the Moores and 19 their CPA have relevant information on how the Moores calculated their claimed refund of 20 \$14,729 and how the Moores determined the treatment of all other items on their returns. Id. The 21 United States needs this information to identify and raise any offsets to the Moores' claimed 22 overpayment, without which it cannot present a full opposition to the Moores' motion for 23 summary judgment (again, assuming the Moore prevail on the § 965 issues). Janis, 428 U.S. at

U.S. Rule 56(d) Motion (Case No. 2:19-cv-1539-JCC)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

24

3

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE Tax Division, Western Region P.O. Box 683 Washington, D.C. 20044 Telephone: 202-307-6547 440; *Lewis*, 284 U.S. at 283; *see*, *e.g.*, *Atigeo*, 2014 WL 1494062, at *3–4 (granting Rule 56(d) request supported by declaration from counsel identifying relevant information sought, including written discovery requests and depositions).

The United States satisfies the Ninth Circuit's requirements for a Rule 56(d) request. *Employers Teamsters*, 353 F.3d at 1129.

CONCLUSION

If the Court denies the United States' motion to dismiss (Dkt. No. 26) or otherwise finds 26 U.S.C. § 965 unconstitutional, it should grant the United States' Rule 56(d) motion, defer consideration of the Moores' summary judgment motion until after the close of discovery, and allow the United States thirty (30) days after the close of discovery to supplement its summary judgment opposition.

Dated: May 11, 2020

Respectfully submitted, RICHARD E. ZUCKERMAN Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General /s/ Jennifer Y. Golden JENNIFER Y. GOLDEN Trial Attorney KARI M. LARSON Senior Litigation Counsel U.S. Department of Justice, Tax Division P.O. Box 683, Ben Franklin Station Washington, D.C. 20044 Tel: 202-616-3822 (Larson) Tel: 202-307-6547 (Golden) Fax: 202-307-0054 Kari.M.Larson@usdoj.gov Jennifer.Y.Golden@usdoj.gov Attorneys for the United States of America 24 **U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE** U.S. Rule 56(d) Motion 4 Tax Division, Western Region (Case No. 2:19-cv-1539-JCC) P.O. Box 683 Washington, D.C. 20044

Telephone: 202-307-6547

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

1

2	I hereby certify that on May 11, 2020, I served a copy of the foregoing document by			
3	filing a copy through the Court's CM/ECF system, which will send an electronic copy to:			
4	James R. Morrison (<u>jmorrison@bakerlaw.com</u>) Baker & Hostetler LLP			
5	999 Third Avenue Suite 3600			
6	Seattle, WA 98104-4040			
7	Andrew M. Grossman (<u>agrossman@bakerlaw.com</u>) David B. Rivkin, Jr. (<u>drivkin@bakerlaw.com</u>)			
8				
9	Nicholas C. Mowbray (<u>nmowbray@bakerlaw.com</u>) Baker & Hostetler LLP			
10	Washington Square, Suite 1100 1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.			
11	Washington, D.C. 20036-5304			
12	Competitive Enterprise Institute Sam Kazman (<u>Sam.Kazman@cei.org</u>)			
13	Devin Watkins (<u>Devin.Watkins@cei.org</u>) 1310 L Street NW, 7th Floor			
14	Washington, D.C. 20005			
15	Attorneys for Plaintiffs			
16				
17	Respectfully submitted,			
18	/s/ Jennifer Y. Golden JENNIFER Y. GOLDEN			
19	Trial Attorney, Tax Division U.S. Department of Justice			
20	U.S. Department of Justice			
21				
22				
23				
24	U.S. Rule 56(d) Motion 5 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (Case No. 2:19-cv-1539-JCC) Tax Division, Western Region P.O. Box 683			

Tax Division, Western Region P.O. Box 683 Washington, D.C. 20044 Telephone: 202-307-6547