

- Eduardo Rivera prepares, promotes, and sells abusive tax schemes
  purporting to exempt his customers from federal income taxation. He markets his
  schemes, which he describes as "legal documentation, educational materials, and
  workshops to educate, inspire and assist the people in their desire to opt out of the
  voluntary tax system with the least amount of risk," through his website
  <a href="https://www.EdRivera.com">www.EdRivera.com</a>. Cantrell Decl., Ex. A at 13-14 (Docket Entry No. 13).
- Rivera claims on his website that private employers are not required to withhold federal taxes from their employees' wages. He urges employers to stop withholding federal taxes, and warns them that doing so "creates a real liability for the private employer." Id. at 73-80.
- 3. On his website, Rivera states that "[i]f you do not file [U.S. Individual Income Tax] returns, you have no federal income tax liability. There is no other means by which [you] . . . can be subject to or liable for any income tax." Id. at 188.
- 4. Rivera sells opinion letters consisting of frivolous arguments such as that the federal income tax is voluntary, that Americans employed in the private sector are exempt from federal income tax and do not need to file federal returns, and that the IRS has no authority to assess or collect taxes. He charges five different rates for his opinion letters: \$100 for a single letter delivered via e-mail, if paid for electronically; \$150 for a single letter delivered via mail, if paid for by postal money order; \$500 for four letters, including research and a motion to dismiss a federal indictment; \$1,000 for four letters, with research and a motion to dismiss a federal indictment, plus documents "to establish business and personal non-liability;" and \$2,000 for "a complete package of [his] opinion letters, agent letters, lien, levy, law suit and employer kit." *Id.* at 13.

<ol><li>Rivera markets his opinion letters for use in avoiding criminal charges,</li></ol>
for submission to the IRS, and for persuading bankers to resist IRS collection
efforts. Id. He advises customers to rely on his opinion letters in deciding to
"opt[] out" of payroll withholding taxes. Id. He further explains that the
purpose of [his] opinion letters is to provide a reliance defense
for the recipient should there be a need to establish that the matters of
fact and law expressed in the opinion letter were relied on by the
person for whom the letter was written.
Id. at 57.
<ol><li>Rivera drafts letters for his customers to give to their employers</li></ol>
demanding that they stop withholding taxes. Id. at 82-84.
<ol><li>Rivera customers Gale and Judy Webb sent the IRS two of his opinion</li></ol>
letters, both dated February 26, 2003. Mendenhall Decl., Exs. A-B (Docket Entry
No. 14). In these letters, Rivera claims that because the Webbs failed to file tax
returns for 1998, 1999, or 2000, they "have no legal duty to make and file a U.S.
Individual Income Tax Return and pay the tax on those returns for any years in the
future." Id., Ex. A at 1. "I can assure you," he writes, "that unless you are
employed by the government of the United States you are not liable for any federal
income tax" and are not required to file a tax return. Id., Ex. B at 2. He
recommends that the Webbs "share a copy" of his opinion letters with the IRS and
"demand that [the IRS] either produce evidence that you are engaged in an
excisable activity or cease and desist from making such claims on your income."
Id. at 11. He advises the Webbs to
aggressively pursue a program of asset protection. Among the
various programs for asset protection are transferring title to your

business interests and other property (and even the possession, if you

The state of the s

so choose) into trust, or a corporation or other legal entity, keeping your assets off-shore, and the like. An additional benefit is that if the government can't prove that you have a substantial amount of income, or if you lack reachable assets, the likelihood that they will pursue you is greatly diminished.

Id. at 12.

8. Rivera posts sample opinion letters on his website. In one, which he recommends a customer send to the IRS, Rivera states that his critique of [an IRS notice of intent to levy] will assist the IRS employee that sent this to you in making an early determination that you do not have any liability of any kind. . . . If this matter does progress, it will be necessary for the [IRS] employee to identify, with specificity and particularity, the exact nature and identification of the government to which this Department of the Treasury and Internal Revenue Service pertains.

Cantrell Decl., Ex. A at 57 (Docket Entry No: 13). He concludes that "I.R.C. Section 6331 does not apply to those in the private sector and even if it did the only way a federal income tax liability can be created is for a person to make a U.S. Individual Income Tax Return that creates one." *Id.* at 60. "All federal income taxes . . . have . . . to be voluntary to be legal." *Id.* 

9. For \$3,500 a year, Rivera represents customers before the IRS. Id. at 14. He advertises that his representation consists of a "power of attorney so that [he] can respond to all IRS notices and establish in your record that you have no liability." Id. He also sends the IRS Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests, demanding copies of "what the IRS has put on your file." Id.

- 0	
	<ol> <li>Touting the effectiveness of his representation service on his website,</li> </ol>
Ì	Rivera quotes a customer as declaring "victory I haven't heard anything from
	the IRS since you sent your letter to them. Thanks!" Id. at 11.
	<ol> <li>Rivera begins his representation by sending the IRS an IRS Form 2848.</li> </ol>
	Power of Attorney and Declaration of Representative, stating that the purpose of
- 1	his representation is to "DETERMINE NON-LIABILITY FOR ALL FEDERAL
1	•

TAXATION." Gornik Decl., Ex. A (Docket Entry No. 14); Spencer Decl., Ex. B (Docket Entry No. 14); Ciarrocchi Decl., Ex. B (Docket Entry No. 14); Rosa Decl., Ex. A (Docket Entry No. 14).

12. Rivera sent Revenue Officer Arlie Alexander a "demand for [Alexander's] personal written authority" to collect taxes from Rivera's customer Scherer Farms, Inc. Alexander Decl., Ex. C (Docket Entry No. 14). He claimed that Scherer Farms, Inc. "is a nonfiler . . . [and] has ceased to volunteer to be involved in federal income taxes." Id., Ex. A at 5.

13. For his customer Sherri Tenpenny, Rivera complained to the IRS that [Revenue Officer Thomas] Spencer, apparently completely unaware that Ms. Tenpenny was not an individual who receives federal income, took it upon himself to alter or change the official Individual Master File to indicate that she had a federal income tax liability. [Tenpenny] owes no taxes.

Spencer Decl., Ex. C at 7, 10 (Docket Entry No. 14).

several letters to Revenue Officer David Ciarrocchi, "demand[ing] . . . [Ciarrocchi's] personal written authority to . . . [p]erform any claimed official duty." Ciarrocchi Decl. ¶¶ 2-4, 7-9, Ex. A at 3 (Docket Entry No. 14). Rivera asserted that Sikma Plumbing was not liable for federal income tax and that he had

On behalf of customer Sikma Plumbing Company, Inc., Rivera wrote

1

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

"steadfastly sought to establish [Sikma Plumbing's] status as a nonfiler with the
Internal Revenue Service." Id., Ex. E at 17. He claimed that Sikma Plumbing
"has revoked all prior income tax returns and will never again make
himself [sic] liable for any state or federal income tax by making a return." Id. at
15. His customers do not "elect to pay [the federal income tax] and there is no
power or authority in the democracy or republic that can force them to pay." Id.,
Ex. F at 26.

- 15. For his customers Robert P. and Nancy A. Louthen, Rivera sent the IRS several letters claiming that they were entitled to a federal tax refund and challenging IRS attempts to collect taxes from them. Rosa Decl., Exs. A-F (Docket Entry No. 14). In these letters, Rivera argued that there is "no public law that imposes an income tax or any other tax on or measured by income, wages or earnings." Id., Ex. A at 5.
- 16. Rivera claims on his website that violations of the internal revenue laws are not crimes, and that he can prove "the non-existence of tax crimes." Cantrell Decl., Ex. A at 143. He also claims that people cannot be convicted of tax crimes because federal district courts do not have any judicial power over people living in the fifty states. *Id.* at 308.
- 17. Rivera has recently announced in a newsletter that he will modify his program by selling his opinions in book form, rather than in letter form, and by claiming that federal taxes are "consensual," rather than "voluntary." 2d Cantrell Decl., Ex. A at 5-7 (Docket Entry No. 17). He acknowledges, however, that

"[t]here is . . . little difference between consensual and voluntary." Id. at 6.

18. Rivera is seeking to expand his operation by recruiting attorneys to join him in his "profitable and exciting business." Cantrell Decl., Ex. A at 334-35 (Docket Entry No. 13). Attorneys associated with him write letters and hold

ı	meetings, seminars, and workshops for employers, tax professionals, and the
	general public to "reveal the truth" that Americans are not liable for federal taxes.
	Id. at 335. Rivera supplies attorneys with a "legal package complete with
	everything that you need to begin this exciting and profitable business," including
	IRS forms and "responses needed for various letters and notices that the IRS is
	likely to send to you." Id. He even provides an assistant "who will come into
	your office and set up your files and computer with everything you need to get
	started." Id.
l	19. In his website and letters, Rivera makes numerous false and fraudulent
	statements concerning the internal revenue laws and the effectiveness of his tax
	schemes; including the following
	<ul> <li>(a) only federal employees are subject to federal income tax;</li> </ul>
	(b) private-sector employers are not required to withhold federal taxes
	from their employees' wages;
	<ul><li>(c) federal taxes are voluntary or consensual;</li></ul>
	(d) filing federal tax returns is voluntary;
	<ul><li>(e) the IRS does not have the authority to assess or collect taxes;</li></ul>
I	<ul> <li>(f) federal income tax can be avoided by not filing federal income tax</li> </ul>
	returns;
	<ul><li>(g) federal tax liability can be avoided by relying on Rivera's opinions;</li></ul>
	(h) Rivera's letters will cause the IRS to cease assessment or collection
	activities;
	<ul> <li>(i) Rivera's letters will have any effect upon IRS liens and levies;</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>(j) Rivera can establish in IRS records that his customers have no federa</li> </ul>
	tax liability;

(k)

violation of the internal revenue laws is not a crime; and

(1)	people cannot be convicted of a tax crime because no federal dis	
	court has jurisdiction over them.	
20	Contament who follow Division advise do not file foderal tour natures	

20. Customers who follow Rivera's advice do not file federal tax returns or pay federal taxes. Rivera directs his customers to resist IRS examination and collection efforts with copies of his opinion letters, and writes the IRS on behalf of his customers. While his letters are frivolous on their face, the IRS must still

expend time and resources processing them. Mendenhall Decl. (Docket Entry No.

14); Alexander Decl. (Docket Entry No. 14); Spencer Decl. (Docket Entry No. 14); Ciarrocchi Decl. (Docket Entry No. 14); Rosa Decl. (Docket Entry No. 14).

21. Rivera is causing and will continue to cause substantial revenue losses to the United States. The IRS has identified six customers on whose behalf Rivera is attempting to block IRS examination and collection procedures; those six customers have unpaid assessments or audit deficiencies totaling \$9,580,771.71 in tax, interest, and penalties. Yung Decl. ¶¶ 8-9. The IRS will have to devote substantial time and resources simply to identify Rivera's customers, and may be

22. The harm caused by Rivera is ongoing and immediate. Through his website, Rivera is currently promoting and selling his abusive tax schemes. He has drafted opinion letters as recently as February 26, 2003. Mendenhall Decl., Exs. A-B (Docket Entry No. 14). His recruitment of other attorneys to join his "profitable and exciting business," Cantrell Decl., Ex. A at 334-35 (Docket Entry

unable to detect and recover all the revenue loss attributable to Rivera.

No. 13), demonstrates that absent an injunction, Rivera will seek to expand his operation. Similarly, his recent announcement of slight changes to his promotion show that he intends to continue his abusive tax schemes indefinitely. 2d Cantrell

Decl., Ex. A at 5, 7 (Docket Entry No. 17). Until Rivera is enjoined, the United

I

States will continue to lose revenue, as he enlists more taxpayers with his active		
promotion.		
23. Rivera is a licensed attorney. Cantrell Decl., Ex. A at 5 (Docket Entry		
No. 13).		
<ol> <li>Rivera has stated in his newsletter that he has "decided to let the Office</li> </ol>		
of the U.S. Attorney attempt to take a default in its suit." 2d Cantrell Decl., Ex. A		
at 4 (Docket Entry No. 17).		
25. Rivera, having failed to answer or otherwise respond the United States'		
complaint, is in default. Default was entered against him on May 9, 2003.		
26. Rivera is neither an infant nor an incompetent, and he is not in the		
military. Cantrell Decl., Ex. A at 6.		
<ol> <li>The United States served Rivera with notice of its motion for default</li> </ol>		
judgment and permanent injunction. Graham Decl. ¶ 5 (Docket Entry No. 15).		
II. Conclusions of Law		
<ol> <li>Where a party fails to plead or otherwise defend against a complaint, and</li> </ol>		
after entry of default, default judgment may be entered against such him. Fed. R.		
Civ. P. 55.		
<ol><li>Because Rivera has failed to plead or otherwise defend against the</li></ol>		
United States' complaint, default judgment may be entered against him.		
3. In this district, motions for default judgment must set forth (1) when and		
against which party the default was entered; (2) the identification of the pleading		
to which default was entered; (3) whether the defaulting party is an infant or		
incompetent person, and if so, whether that person is adequately represented; (4)		
that the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 does not apply; and (5) that		
notice of the application has been served on the defaulting party, if required.		
<ol> <li>The United States' motion for default judgment met these requirements.</li> </ol>		

2

- 5. In considering whether to enter default judgment, this Court considers (1) the possibility of prejudice to the plaintiff, (2) the merits of plaintiff's substantive claim, (3) the sufficiency of the complaint, (4) the sum of money at stake in the action, (5) the possibility of a dispute concerning material facts, (6) whether the default was due to excusable neglect, and (7) the strong policy underlying the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure favoring decisions on the merits.
- The United States will be prejudiced if default judgment is not entered. Rivera is causing substantial harm to the United States by advising people not to pay their federal income taxes, not to withhold taxes from their employees' wages, and not to file federal tax returns, and by representing people before the IRS, where he obstructs IRS examination and collection procedures. To deny the United States' motion for default judgment would leave the United States without a remedy.
- 7. The United States' claims against Rivera are meritorious and are sufficiently set forth in the United States' complaint. The evidence submitted with the United States' motion establishes that Rivera is subject to injunction under both I.R.C. §§ 7408 and 7402(a).
- 8. In order to obtain a permanent injunction under I.R.C. § 7408, the United States must show that (1) Rivera engaged in conduct subject to penalty under §§ 6700 or 6701; and (2) injunctive relief is appropriate to prevent the recurrence of such conduct.
- 9. To establish a violation of § 6700 warranting an injunction under § 7408, the United States must show that: (1) Rivera organized or sold, or participated in the organization or sale of, an entity, plan, or arrangement; (2) Rivera made or caused to be made, false or fraudulent statements concerning the tax benefits to be derived from the entity, plan, or arrangement; (3) Rivera knew or had reason to

27

know that the statements were false or fraudulent; (4) the false or fraudulent statements pertained to a material matter; and (5) an injunction is necessary to prevent recurrence of this conduct. See United States v. Estate Pres. Servs., 202 F.3d 1093, 1098 (9th Cir. 2000).

- 10. Rivera organized and sold a tax plan or arrangement that he describes on his website as "legal documentation, educational materials, and workshops to educate, inspire and assist the people in their desire to opt out of the voluntary tax system with the least amount of risk." Cantrell Decl., Ex. A at 13-14 (Docket Entry No. 13). Using the Internet to market his promotion, Rivera sets prices starting at \$100 for a single opinion letter and going up to \$3,500 a year for representation before the IRS. Cantrell Decl., Ex. A at 13-14 (Docket Entry No. 13).
- 11. Rivera made or caused to be made false and fraudulent statements concerning the tax benefits to be derived from his tax plan or arrangement. He advertises that his opinion letters and representation services will assist customers in "opt[ing] out of the voluntary tax system with the least amount of risk." Id. at 13. He claims that he will "establish in [his customers' IRS] record[s] that [they] have no liability," and that by relying on his letters, his customers can avoid paying federal income taxes and can avoid IRS examination and collection efforts. Id. at 14. In his website and letters, Rivera makes numerous false and fraudulent statements concerning the internal revenue laws and the effectiveness of his tax schemes; including the following:
  - (a) only federal employees are subject to federal income tax;
  - (b) private-sector employers are not required to withhold federal taxes from their employees' wages;
  - (c) federal taxes are voluntary or consensual;

(d) filing federal tax returns is voluntary; the IRS does not have the authority to assess or collect taxes; (e) federal income tax can be avoided by not filing federal income tax (f) returns: as stated therein 1/00 h federal tax liability can be avoided by relying on Rivera's opinions, (g) Rivera's letters will cause the IRS to cease assessment or collection (h) activities; Rivera's letters will have any effect upon IRS liens and levies; (i) Rivera can establish in IRS records that his customers have no federal (i) tax liability; violation of the internal revenue laws is not a crime; and (k) (l) people cannot be convicted of a tax crime because no federal district court has jurisdiction over them. 12. Rivera has every reason to know that his statements regarding the benefits to be derived from participation in his tax scheme are begus, As he frequently reminds his customers and the recipients of his letters, he is a licensed attorney and has been practicing law for thirty years. Cantrell Decl., Ex. A at 4-8 (Docket Entry No. 13); Alexander Decl., Ex. C at 17 (Docket Entry No. 14); Ciarrocchi Decl., Ex. A at 3, E at 15 (Docket Entry No. 14); Mendenall Decl., Ex. B at 11-12 (Docket Entry No. 14). As such, he knows that his frivolous letters will not affect his customer's tax liability or prevent IRS assessment and collection. Even cursory research would reveal that his "opinions" - that privatesector employees are exempt from federal taxation, that the IRS has no authority to assess and collect taxes, and that paying taxes is voluntary — are without merit and have been universally rejected by the courts. See United States v. Raymond, 228 F.3d 804, 812 (7th Cir. 2000) (characterizing "representations that payment of United States v. Rivera

1

2

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

K

4	wage earners is a preposterous reading of the statute."); Biermann v.			
5	Commissioner, 769 F.2d 707 (11th Cir. 1985) (rejecting tax protestor's arguments			
6	that wages are not income, that he is not subject to withholding taxes, and that he			
7	is not liable for tax as "patently frivolous" and "warrant[ing] no further			
8	discussion."); Peth v. Breitzmann, 611 F. Supp. 50, 53 (E.D. Wis. 1985) (finding			
9	that plaintiff's arguments that, as a private-sector employee, his wages are not			
10	subject to federal taxes and withholding are "wrong"); In re Weatherly, 169 B.R.			
11	555, 560 (Bankr. E.D. Pa. 1994) ("easily" rejecting debtor's argument that only			
12	federal employees are subject to federal income tax).			
13	13. Rivera's false and fraudulent statements strike at the very heart of the			
14	internal revenue laws: the obligation to pay tax and file returns, the employer's			
15	obligation to withhold and pay over payroll taxes to the IRS, and the IRS's			
16	authority to assess and collect taxes.			
17	<ol><li>Accordingly, River is in violation of I.R.C. § 6700.</li></ol>			
18	<ol><li>I.R.C. § 6701 is violated when a person prepares or assists in the</li></ol>			
19	preparation of "any portion of a return, affidavit, claim, or other document," that			
20	he "knows (or has reason to believe) will be used in connection with any material			
21	matter" under the internal revenue laws and that he knows will "result in an			
22	understatement of the liability for tax." I.R.C. § 6701.			
23	<ol> <li>Rivera is violating I.R.C. § 6701 with his opinion letters and his letters</li> </ol>			
24	to the IRS on behalf of his customers. He prepares these letters for his customers			
25	to rely on in "opting" out of federal taxes, and to use as a "reliance defense"			
26	against the IRS. Cantrell Decl., Ex. A at 13, 57 (Docket Entry No. 13). Thus, he			
27				
28	Default Judgment and Permanent Injunction Page 13 of 23 United States v. Rivera No. CV 03-2520-GHK(JWJx)			

income tax is a voluntary activity" as "clearly false"); United States v. Latham,

U.S.C. § 3401(c) the category of 'employee' does not include privately employed

754 F.2d 747, 750 (7th Cir.1985) (finding that the contention that "under 26

2

1	knows that his letters will be used in connection with a material matter under the
2	I.R.C. — the determination of civil and criminal liability relating to federal income
3	tax — and he knows that his letters will result in an understatement of liability for
4	tax — he claims that his customers have none. Alexander Decl., Ex. A at 5
5	(Docket Entry No. 14); Spencer Decl., Ex. C at 10 (Docket Entry No. 14);
6	Ciarrocchi Decl., Ex. E at 17 (Docket Entry No. 14).
7	17. An injunction under I.R.C. § 7408 is necessary to prevent a recurrence
8	of Rivera's violation of both I.R.C. §§ 6700 and 6701 because he is actively
9	promoting his abusive tax schemes. Absent an injunction, he will only continue
10	his "exciting and profitable business" of luring customers into evading federal
11	income tax. Cantrell Decl., Ex. A at 335 (Docket Entry No. 13). Knowing full
12	well that his claims are mendagious and have been repeatedly rejected by courts,
13	Rivera is unlikely to discontinue his abusive tax scheme unless he is ordered to do
14	so. He is seeking to expand his promotion by recruiting other attorneys to join
15	him. Even while anticipating that default judgment will be entered against him,
16	Rivera stated in his newsletter that he will continue his promotion with only
17	cosmetic changes: he will sell his opinion letters in book format and change his
18	claim that taxes are "voluntary" to taxes are "consensual." 2d Cantrell Decl., Ex.

A at 5-7 (Docket Entry No. 17).

 Accordingly, the Court finds that Rivera should be permanently enjoined under I.R.C. § 7408 from violating I.R.C. §§ 6700 and 6701.

19. In order to obtain a permanent injunction under I.R.C. § 7402(a), the United States must show that an injunction is necessary or appropriate for the enforcement of the internal revenue laws. I.R.C. § 7402(a) grants federal district courts broad authority to issue injunctions and other orders enforcing the internal revenue laws, even where the United States has other remedies available. Because

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

§ 7402(a) explicitly provides that the injunction remedy is "in addition to and no
exclusive of" other remedies for enforcing the internal revenue laws, the United
States need not establish that it has no adequate remedy at law for an injunction
under § 7402(a).

- 20. The United States has shown that Rivera is impeding the IRS's assessment and collection efforts by advising his customers not to file federal tax returns and not to pay federal taxes. Further, the IRS must expend valuable time and resources in processing Rivera's frivolous letters. Accordingly, the Court finds that a permanent injunction under I.R.C. § 7402(a) is necessary and appropriate for the enforcement of the internal revenue laws.
- 21. In addition, a permanent injunction is appropriate under the Ninth Circuit's permanent injunction standard: there is a likelihood of substantial and immediate irreparable injury if an injunction is not issued, and there are no adequate remedies at law.
- 22. Rivera is causing the United States substantial and immediate irreparable injury. He has stymied the collection of more than \$ 9 million from the six identified customers alone. Yung Decl., ¶¶ 8-9 (Docket Entry No. 14). As he shows no sign of ending his scheme, and indeed is seeking to expand it by recruiting other attorneys to join him, the United States will continue to lose money as long as Rivera is in operation. Given the IRS's limited resources, identifying and recouping the lost revenue may be impossible.
- 23. The United States has no adequate remedy at law to address the substantial and immediate irreparable harm Rivera is causing. Apart from an injunction, the United States has no means, civilly, of stopping Rivera.
- 24. Accordingly, the Court fixed that Rivera should be permanently enjoined from interfering with the enforcement of the internal revenue laws.

- 25. The United States is not seeking monetary damages here, but is only requesting an injunction against future violations.
- 26. Even if Rivera had answered the complaint, it is unlikely that the material facts would be in dispute. His own words, found on his website and in his letters, provide the bulk of the evidence against him.
- 27. That Rivera is an attorney and was properly served makes it improbable that his default was caused by excusable neglect. Further, he has distributed several newsletters discussing this lawsuit, thus demonstrating beyond any doubt that he is fully cognizant of the complaint and has deliberately chosen not to answer. Cantrell Decl., Exs. B-E (Docket Entry No. 13); 2d Cantrell Decl., Ex. A (Docket Entry No. 17). Recently, he acknowledged in his newsletter that he received the United States motion for default judgment and permanent injunction and had decided to allow the United States to "take a default" against him. 2d Cantrell Decl., Ex. A at 4-5.
- 28. While Rivera's failure to answer the complaint or respond to the United States' motion for default judgment and permanent injunction precludes a decision on the merits, the United States has produced sufficient evidence with its motion to show that a permanent injunction is warranted. If would be unjust to permit to show that a permanent injunction is warranted. If would be unjust to permit to show that a permanent injunction is warranted. If would be unjust to permit to show that a permanent injunction is warranted. If would be unjust to permit to show that a permanent injunction is warranted. If would be unjust to permit to show that a permanent injunction is warranted. If would be unjust to permit to show that a permanent injunction is warranted. If would be unjust to permit to show that a permanent injunction is warranted. If would be unjust to permit to show that a permanent injunction is warranted. If would be unjust to permit to permit to show that a permanent injunction is warranted. If would be unjust to permit to per

7:ndwqs For III/Permanent Injunction

The Court finds that injunction against Rivera should be permanent because he is actively engaged in promoting his abusive tax schemes. He is currently soliciting customers through his website. He has shown, through his recent announcement that he will continue his promotion after default judgment with only minor modifications (selling his opinions in book rather than letter form and

injunction # appropriate.

using the term "consensual" in place of "voluntary"), that he has no intention of halting his promotion. Indeed, he is seeking to expand it by recruiting other attorneys to join him.

Rivera's actions are causing the United States irreparable harm. Customers who follow Rivera's advice do not file federal income tax returns or pay their federal income taxes. He directs his customers to resist IRS examination and collection efforts with copies of his opinion letters, and writes the IRS on behalf of his customers. While his letters are frivolous on their face, the IRS must still expend time and resources processing them. By directing his customers to rely on these letters in resisting the IRS, Rivera impedes IRS examination and collection efforts.

the United States. The IRS has identified six customers on whose behalf Rivera is attempting to block IRS examination and collection procedures; those six customers have unpaid assessments or audit deficiencies totaling \$9,580,771.71 in tax, interest, and penalties. The IRS will have to devote substantial time and resources simply to identify his customers, and may be unable to detect and recover all the revenue loss attributable to him.

Rivera is causing and will continue to cause substantial revenue losses to

Until Rivera is permanently enjoined, the United States will continue to lose revenue, as he enlists more taxpayers. The United States has no adequate remedy at law to prevent Rivera from causing further harm. Thus, a permanent injunction is necessary to stop Rivera.

## IV. Order and Permenent Injunction

Based on the foregoing findings of fact and conclusions of law and for good cause shown, the Court ORDERS that Rivera and his agents, servants, employees,

28 Default Judgment and Permanent Injunction

United States v. Rivera No. CV 03-2520-GHK(JWJx)

2

3

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

	(0)	4	
, 1	(8)	that Rivera's letters will cause the IRS to cease assessment or	
2		collection activities;	
3	(9)	that Rivera's letters will have any effect upon IRS liens and levies;	
4	(10)	that Rivera can establish in IRS records that his customers have no	
. 5		federal tax liability;	
6	(11)	that violation of the internal revenue laws is not a crime; or	
7, 7	(12)	that people cannot be convicted of a tax crime because no federal	
8		district court has jurisdiction over them; and	
9	d. Engaging in any other activity subject to penalty under I.R.C. §§ 6700 or		
10	6701;		
111	e. Fu	rther, the Court ORDERS that Rivera mail a copy of this Default	
12	Judgment and Permanent Injunction to all persons who have purchased any of his		
13	plans or arrangements, including but not limited to his opinion letters (whether in		
14	letter, book, or any other form) his representation of customers before the IRS, his		
15	recruitment of other attorneys to join his promotions, or his seminars or		
16	workshops,	that advocate or represent:	
17	(1)	that only federal employees are subject to federal income tax;	
18	(2)	that private-sector employers are not required to withhold federal	
19		taxes from their employees' wages;	
20	(3)	that federal taxes are voluntary or consensual;	
21	(4)	that filing federal tax returns is voluntary;	
22	(5)	that the IRS does not have the authority to assess or collect taxes;	
23	(6)	that federal income tax can be avoided by not filing federal income	
24		tax returns;	
25	(7)	that federal tax liability can be avoided by relying on Rivera's	
26		opinions; 9/or his operar letters	
27		. ^	
28	Default Judgmen Permanent Injuni		

Aecru

that Rivera's letters will cause the IRS to cease examination or (8) 1 collection activities; that Rivera's letters will have any effect upon IRS liens and levies; (9) 3 that Rivera can establish in IRS records that his customers have no (10)federal tax liability; that violation of the internal revenue laws is not a crime; or 6 that people cannot be convicted of a tax crime because no federal (12)7 district court has jurisdiction over them. f. Further, the Court ORDERS Rivera to produce to the United States any records under his possession, custody, or control, identifying by name, Social 10 Security Number, address, and telephone number all individuals who have 11 purchased any of his plans or arrangements, including but not limited to his 12 opinion letters (whether in letter, book, or any other form), his representation of 13 customers before the IRS, his recruitment of other attorneys to join his 14 promotions, or his seminars or workshops, that advocate or represent: 15 (1) that only federal employees are subject to federal income tax; 16 that private-sector employers are not required to withhold federal (2) 17 taxes from their employees' wages; 18 (3) that federal taxes are voluntary or consensual; 19 (4) that filing federal tax returns is voluntary; 20 (5)that the IRS does not have the authority to assess or collect taxes: 21 (6) that federal income tax can be avoided by not filing federal income 22 tax returns; 23 that federal tax liability can be avoided by relying on Rivera's (7) 24 opinions; as set forth in the websett edentified in TPI of the teachings of Fact, about, of or his openion lecters; 25 26 27 Default Judgment and 28 Page 20 of 23 Permanent Injunction

(8)	that Rivera's letters will cause the IRS to cease examination or
	collection activities;
(9)	that Rivera's letters will have any effect upon IRS liens and levies;
(10)	that Rivera can establish in IRS records that his customers have no
,	federal tax liability;
(11)	that violation of the internal revenue laws is not a crime; or
(12)	to the design of the same and the same and federal
	district court has jurisdiction over them.
g. F	urther, the Court ORDERS that within ten days of this order Rivera,
-	resentatives, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, and those persons
	oncert or participation with him, remove from his websites, including
	ivera.com, all abusive tax scheme promotional materials, false
	al speech, and materials designed to incite others imminently to violate
the law, an	ed to display for one year on the www.EdRivera.com "Home" page (i.e.,
the first pa	ge seen when accessing the website at the listed address), prominently
featured at	the top so that it is easily visible and readable without further action, a
	copy of the Court's permanent injunction. Specifically, Rivera is
	D to remove from his website all materials promoting his plans or
	ents, including but not limited to his opinion letters (whether in letter,
	ny other form), his representation of customers before the IRS, his
	nt of other attorneys to join his promotions, or his seminars or
1	s, that advocate or represent:
(1)	that only federal employees are subject to federal income tax;
(2)	that private-sector employers are not required to withhold federal
	taxes from their employees' wages;
(3)	that federal taxes are voluntary or consensual;
	United States v. Rive

<li>(4) that filing federal tax returns is voluntary;</li>	
<ul><li>(5) that the IRS does not have the authority to assess or collect taxes;</li></ul>	
(6) that federal income tax can be avoided by not filing federal income	
tax returns;	
(7) that people can avoid federal tax liability by relying on Rivera's	
opinions Stel	
(8) that Rivera's letters will cause the IRS to cease examination or	
collection activities;	
<ul><li>(9) that Rivera's letters will have any effect upon IRS liens and levies;</li></ul>	
(10) that Rivera can establish in IRS records that his customers have no	
federal tax liability;	
(11) that violation of the internal revenue laws is not a crime; or	
(12) that people cannot be convicted of a tax crime because no federal	
district court has jurisdiction over them.	
The Court will retain jurisdiction over this matter to ensure compliance with	h
this order.	
IT IS SO ORDERED.	
1/12	
Dated:	
United States District Judge	
Presented by: Culo 7/2/02	
Robert F. Conte	
Tablistain Chied States Attorney	
Default Judgment and United States v. Rivera	
	(5) that the IRS does not have the authority to assess or collect taxes; (6) that federal income tax can be avoided by not filing federal income tax returns; (7) that people can avoid federal tax liability by relying on Rivera's opinions; (8) that Rivera's letters will cause the IRS to cease examination or collection activities; (9) that Rivera's letters will have any effect upon IRS liens and levies; (10) that Rivera can establish in IRS records that his customers have no federal tax liability; (11) that violation of the internal revenue laws is not a crime; or (12) that people cannot be convicted of a tax crime because no federal district court has jurisdiction over them.  The Court will retain jurisdiction over this matter to ensure compliance with this order.  IT IS SO ORDERED.  Dated: 7/8/03  GEORGE H. KING United States District Judge