I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check box if you are representing yourself □)					DEFEND	ANTS							
SANTA YNEZ BAND OF MISSION INDIANS					UNITED STATES OF AMERICA								
	Attorneys (Firm Name, A yourself, provide same.) SEE ATTACHMENT	ddress a	nd Telephone Number If	you are	representing	Attorneys	(If Known)						
II. B	ASIS OF JURISDICTIO	N (Plac	e an X in one box only )							For Diversity Cases	s Only		
☐ I U.S. Government Plaintiff ☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)			(Place an X in one box for plaintiff and o  PTF  Citizen of This State □ 1			PTF D	DEF PTF DE			DEF			
<b>1</b> 2 ∪	S. Government Defendar	nt 🗆 4	Diversity (Indicate Citiz of Parties in Item III)	enship	Citizen of Anoth	ner State		12 [	2	Incorporated and of Business in A		□ 5	□ 5
	n.o (n)		-1-7		Citizen or Subje	ct of a Fore	eign Country	3 [	3	Foreign Nation		□ 6	□6
110	RIGIN (Place an X in or original 2 Remov roceeding State C	ed from	nly.)  3 Remanded from Appellate Court		einstated or	Transferr	ed from anothe	r district	(sp	Distr	rict Jud	peal to l ge from gistrate	n
CLAS	QUESTED IN COMPL S ACTION under F.R.C	C.P. 23:	□ Yes 🗹 No			MONEY D	EMANDED I	N COM	_			n 7	
2	AUSE OF ACTION (Cit 6 U.S.C. 7422(A); SUIT	FOR R	EFUND OF FEDERAL II					se. Do n	ot c	ite jurisdictional st	atutes unless di	versity.)	)
VII. N	ATURE OF SUIT (Place	ce an X	in one box only.)						_				
No. of Contract	THER STATUTES		CONTRACT	DEL	TORTS		TORTS			PRISONER PETITIONS	F-9-305 to 1001	BOR	and and
	State Reapportionment Antitrust	The same of the same	Insurance Marine	1	RSONAL INJURY Airplane		PERSONAL	0		Motions to	□ 710 Fair Li Act	abor Sta	indards
	Banks and Banking		Miller Act	□315	Airplane Product Liability		Other Fraud	i		Vacate Sentence	□ 720 Labor/	-	
□ 450	Commerce/ICC Rates/etc.		Negotiable Instrument Recovery of	□ 320	Assault, Libel &	1000	Truth in Lend Other Persona		530	Habeas Corpus General	Relation		
□ 460	Deportation	130	Overpayment &	F2 220	Slander	1007,0007,000	Property Dam	age 🗆 :	535	Death Penalty	Report	6.0	
□ 470	Racketeer Influenced		Enforcement of	□ 330	Fed Employers' Liability	□ 385	Property Dam		540			sure Ac	
	and Corrupt Organizations	□ 151	Judgment Medicare Act	7.000	Marine	B	Product Liabi		550	Other Civil Rights	☐ 740 Railwa ☐ 790 Other		rAct
□ 480	Consumer Credit		Recovery of Defaulted	□ 345	Marine Product Liability	□ 422	Appeal 28 US	100	555	Prison Condition	Litigat		
	Cable/Sat TV		Student Loan (Excl.	□ 350	Motor Vehicle	FT 422	158 Withdrawal 2		10.00	PENALTY	☐ 791 Empl.		C.,
	Selective Service Securities/Commodities/	□ 153	Veterans) Recovery of	□ 355	Motor Vehicle Product Liability		USC 157			Agriculture	PROPERT		HTS
	Exchange		Overpayment of	□ 360	Other Personal	C	VIL RIGHTS		520	Other Food &	□ 820 Copyr	ghts	
□ 875	Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410	□ 160	Veteran's Benefits Stockholders' Suits	CT 763	Injury	The second section is	Voting Employment	П	525	Drug Related	☐ 830 Patent ☐ 840 Trader	nark	
□ 890	Other Statutory Actions		Other Contract	L1 302	Personal Injury- Med Malpractice	- 443	Housing/Acco			Seizure of	SOCIALS	ECURI	
	Agricultural Act	□ 195	Contract Product Liability	□ 365	Personal Injury-	FT 444	mmodations Welfare			Property 21 USC 881	□ 861 HIA (1 □ 862 Black		
□ 892	Economic Stabilization Act	□ 196	Franchise	□ 368	Asbestos Persona		American wit	h De	30	Liquor Laws	□ 863 DIWC		
	Environmental Matters		REAL PROPERTY	-	Injury Product		Disabilities -			R.R. & Truck	(405(g	55.0	./1
	Energy Allocation Act Freedom of Info. Act	111111111111111111111111111111111111111	Land Condemnation Foreclosure	IN.	Liability MMIGRATION	□ 446	American with	- 1 0 0 0 0 0		Airline Regs Occupational	□ 864 SSID		rt
	Appeal of Fee Determi-	□ 230	Rent Lease & Ejectment	100000000000000000000000000000000000000	Naturalization		Disabilities -			Safety /Health	FEDERAL	TAX SI	
	nation Under Equal Access to Justice		Torts to Land Tort Product Liability	□ 463	Application Habeas Corpus-	E1.440	Other Civil		90	Other	▼ 870 Taxes or Def	(U.S. Plendant)	
950	Constitutionality of State Statutes	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	All Other Real Property	- 56	Alien Detainee Other Immigratio Actions		Rights				□ 871 IRS-TI USC 7	hird Par	
		I				1		1					

If yes, list case number(s):			d dismissed, remanded or closed?   No □ Yes
VIII(b). RELATED CASES If yes, list case number(s):		eviously filed in this court that	t are related to the present case? ☑ No ☐ Yes
Civil cases are deemed relate (Check all boxes that apply)	☐ A Arise from the san ☐ B Call for determina ☐ C For other reasons	ne or closely related transaction tion of the same or substantiall would entail substantial duplic	ns, happenings, or events, or ly related or similar questions of law and fact; or ation of labor if heard by different judges, or and one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present
IX. VENUE: (When complete	ing the following informa	tion, use an additional sheet if	necessary )
(a) List the County in this D  ☐ Check here if the govern	istrict, California County ment, its agencies or emp	outside of this District, State is loyees is a named plaintiff. If	f other than California, or Foreign Country, in which EACH named plaintiff resides this box is checked, go to item (b).
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District, State, if other than California; or Foreign Country
SANTA BARBARA			
(b) List the County in this D  Check here if the govern	istrict, California County ment, its agencies or empl	outside of this District, State is oyees is a named defendant. I	f other than California, or Foreign Country, in which EACH named defendant resides If this box is checked, go to item (c)
County in this District *			California County outside of this District, State, if other than California, or Foreign Country
County in this District *  SANTA BARBARA	tion cases, use the locat	ion of the tract of land involv	California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country
* Los Angeles, Orange, San Note: In land condemnation of	Bernardino, Riverside, V	Ventura, Santa Barbara, or S ne tract of land involved	San Luis Obispo Counties
X SIGNATURE OF ATTOR		A -	Date Nov. 17, 2010
Notice to Counsel/Partio	es: The CV-71 (JS-44) C	wed by the Judicial Conference	mation contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings e of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed ing the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.)
Key to Statistical codes relating	g to Social Security Case		
Nature of Suit	Code Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of	f Cause of Action
861	HIA	All claims for health insura Also, include claims by ho program. (42 U.S.C. 1935)	ance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended spitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the iFF(b))
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung (30 U.S.C. 923)	g" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured amended, plus all claims fi	I workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as iled for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widow Act, as amended. (42 U.S.	s or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security .C. 405(g))

SSID

RS1

Act, as amended.

U.S.C. (g))

864

865

All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security

All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42

# I. (b) Attorneys for Plaintiff:

Lauren B. Feldman, SBN 238629 JENKINS & HOGIN, LLP 1230 Rosecrans Avenue, Suite 110 Manhattan Beach, California 90260 310-643-8448

Glenn M. Feldman (Pro Hac Vice Application Pending) MARISCAL, WEEKS, McINTYRE & FRIEDLANDER P.A. 2901 N. Central Avenue, Suite 200 Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2705 602-285-5138

JENKINS & HOGIN, LLP 1 Lauren B. Feldman (SBN 238629) (lfeldman@localgovlaw.com) 2 FILED CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT 1230 Rosecrans Avenue, Suite 110 3 Manhattan Beach, California 90260 NOV 1 7 2010 310-643-8448 (office) 4 310-643-8441 (fax) 5 MARISCAL WEEKS McINTYRE 6 & FRIEDLANDER, P.A. Glenn M. Feldman (Pro Hac Vice Application Pending) 7 (glenn.feldman@mwmf.com) 2901 N. Central Avenue Suite 200 Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2705 602-285-5138 (office) 9 602-285-5100 (fax) 10 Attorneys for Plaintiff Santa Ynez Band of Mission Indians 11 12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 13 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 14 Case No C V 1 0 - 883 SANTA YNEZ BAND OF MISSION 15 INDIANS, a federally recognized 16 Indian Tribe, COMPLAINT FOR 17 Plaintiff, DECLARATORY AND 18 INJUNCTIVE RELIEF V. 19 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 20 Defendant. 21 NATURE OF THE CASE 22 This is an action brought pursuant to 26 U.S.C. § 7422(a) by the Santa 1. 23 Ynez Band of Mission Indians, a federally recognized Indian tribe (hereafter 24 "Santa Ynez" or the "Tribe"), seeking to compel the United States of America, 25 acting through the Internal Revenue Service (hereafter "IRS"), to accept and act 26 upon a claim for refund of approximately \$3.8 million in federal withholding taxes 27 filed by Santa Ynez but rejected as untimely by the IRS. 28

150

2.	For more than sixty years, the U.S. Supreme Court, the Ninth Circuit
Court of	f Appeals, and various district courts in this Circuit have recognized and
applied	the "informal claim" rule (as described in more detail below) to toll the
running	of the statute of limitations on federal tax refund claims.

3. As discussed below, the claim for refund filed by Santa Ynez here, but rejected as untimely by the IRS, met all of the requirements under the "informal claim" rule to toll the running of the statute of limitations on that claim. As a result, this case seeks a declaratory judgment that the claim for refund filed by the Tribe was timely under the "informal claim" rule and an order requiring the IRS to accept, consider and act on that claim pursuant to 26 U.S.C. §§ 3402(d) and 7422(a).

#### THE PARTIES

- 4. Plaintiff Santa Ynez Band of Mission Indians (sometimes also known as the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians) is a federally recognized Indian tribe with a governing body duly recognized by the Secretary of the Interior. The Santa Ynez Band occupies the Santa Ynez Indian Reservation, which is located in Santa Barbara County, California.
- Defendant is the United States of America. Among the constituent entities of the United States government is the Internal Revenue Service.

#### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 6. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 (federal question), 1346(a)(1) (claim against United States for tax refund), and 1362 (federal question brought by an Indian tribe).
- 7. Venue lies in this judicial district under U.S.C. § 1402(a)(2), in that the Tribe's reservation and principal office are located within this district and the tax return underlying this claim was filed in the IRS office located in this district.

often held that a notice fairly advising the Commissioner

of the nature of the taxpayer's claim, which the

Commissioner could reject because it is too general or

because it does not comply with formal requirements of

the statute and regulations, will nevertheless be treated as a

As initially described by the Supreme Court in 1941, the Court had

8.

 claim, where formal defects and lack of specificity have
been remedied by amendment filed after the lapse of the
statutory period.

United States v. Kales, 314 U.S. 186, 194, 62 S. Ct. 214, 86 L. Ed. 132 (1941).

More recently, in Commissioner of Internal Revenue v. Lundy, 516 U.S. 235, 250,
116 S. Ct. 647, 133 L. Ed. 2d 611 (1990), the Court noted that "even a claim [for
refund of taxes] that does not comply with federal regulations might suffice to toll

the limitations period under the Tax Code," citing Kales.

9. The Ninth Circuit has similarly recognized and applied the "informal claim" rule for decades, beginning with <u>United States v. Pierotti</u>, 154 F.2d 758, 761 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1946). And just four year ago, in <u>Commissioner of Internal Revenue v. Ewing</u>, 439 F.3d 1009 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2006), the Ninth Circuit described the "informal claim" rule, and more recent cases that have applied it, as follows:

The doctrine addresses whether an informal claim for a refund should stop the running of the statute of limitations for a refund claim. *First Sec. Bank, N.A. v. Commissioner*, 592 F.2d 1046, 1049 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1979). It is concerned with claims that are "deficient merely in one or two of the technical requirements imposed by the Treasury regulation [26 C.F.R. § 301.6402-2(b)(1)]." *BCS Fin. Corp. v. United States*, 118 F.3d 522, 524 (7<sup>th</sup>

Cir. 1997); see also <u>Kaffenberger v. United States</u>, 314 F.3d 944, 954 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2003) (citing <u>Kales</u> and stating that "the Supreme Court has endorsed informal claims filed within the statutory period that have technical deficiencies, as long as a valid refund claim is subsequently made after the period has run").

Id. at 1015.

 In <u>Stevens v. United States</u>, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 45611 (N.D. Cal. 2006), the District Court outlined the test for application of the rule as follows:

An informal claim is adequate if it: 1) was filed within the statutory period; 2) put the IRS on notice that taxpayer believes an erroneous tax has been assessed; 3) describes the tax and year with sufficient particularity to allow the IRS to undertake an investigation; and 4) while an informal claim may include oral communications, it must have a written component. Finally, any such informal claim must have been followed by a formal claim which remedied any defects in the informal claim.

Id. at \*17 (internal citations and quotations omitted). After applying that test, the court subsequently upheld the taxpayer's right to a refund under the "informal claim" rule, holding that "the delayed filing of the formal refund claim is precisely the sort of harmless non-compliance the informal claim doctrine is intended to excuse." Stevens v. United States, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 65049 (N.D. Cal. 2007) at \*13.

## **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

11. During 2003 and 2004, Santa Ynez made "per capita" payments to its members from revenues derived from gaming activities. Federal law, at 25 U.S.C. § 2710(b)(3)(D), makes such payments subject to federal income taxation and

26 U.S.C. § 3402(r) make such payments subject to federal withholding requirements.

- During 2003 and 2004, Santa Ynez failed to withhold, or underwithheld, federal taxes on payments made to some tribal members.
- 13. The IRS later conducted an audit of Santa Ynez for those years and assessed taxes, interest and penalties against the Tribe for 2003 and 2004.
- 14. On or about May 5, 2006, Santa Ynez paid the IRS \$1,041,745.11 for tax year 2003 and \$2,891,865.76 for tax year 2004 in full satisfaction of all amounts ostensibly owed under the audit.
- Upon information and belief, the IRS received and credited the Tribe's tax payments on or about May 10, 2006.
- 16. Subsequent to making its May, 2006 tax payments to the IRS, the Tribe determined that all, or virtually all, of the tribal members whose taxes had not been withheld, or had been underwithheld, had reported and fully paid their federal income taxes for years 2003 and 2004. As a result, the Tribe overpaid its withholding tax obligation for years 2003 and 2004.
- 17. Title 26, U.S.C. § 3402(d) permits the Tribe, in those circumstances, to claim a refund for the unwithheld or underwithheld taxes (but not penalties or interest) that the Tribe paid to the IRS on behalf of its members as a result of the audit, but which the members subsequently paid themselves.
- 18. Under 26 U.S.C. § 6511(a), a claim for refund of such taxes must be filed "within .... 2 years from the time the tax was paid."
- 19. Upon information and belief, the IRS has determined that the statute of limitations for the Tribe's claim for refund in this case expired on May 10, 2008; two years after the IRS credited the Tribe's payment made on or about May 5, 2006.
- On or about January 22, 2008, and well before the running of the statute of limitations (as calculated by the IRS), Santa Ynez filed a claim for refund

with the IRS for the taxes previously paid by the Tribe for 2003 and 2004, but for which it was entitled to a refund under 26 U.S.C. § 3402(d) (hereafter the "January 22<sup>nd</sup> Claim"). That claim consisted of a cover letter, Form 4670 ("Request For Relief From Payment of Income Tax Withholding"), a total of ninety Forms 4669 ("Statement of Payments Received") executed by individual tribal members attesting to their payment of federal income taxes for 2003 and 2004; worksheets documenting the amount of refund claimed; copies of the IRS audit report and other related documents. Copies of only the cover letter and Form 4670 from the January 22<sup>nd</sup> Claim are attached hereto as Exhibit A.

- 21. The January 22<sup>nd</sup> Claim plainly identified the taxpayer, the type of tax at issue, the tax years in question and the basis of the claim for refund.
- 22. The January 22<sup>nd</sup> Claim was sufficiently particular to allow the IRS to undertake an investigation of the claim. Beginning on April 23, 2008, and continuing through September 17, 2008, the IRS sent the Tribe three letters regarding the January 22<sup>nd</sup> Claim, either asking for additional time to process the claim or requesting additional information.
- 23. In response to the IRS' request, on or about October 1 2008, Santa Ynez sent an additional package of original claims documents to the IRS (the "October 1st Supplement"). Copies of only the cover letter and Form 4670 from the October 1st Supplement are attached hereto as Exhibit B.
- 24. Between October, 2008 and May, 2009, the IRS and the Tribe continued to communicate, by letter and by telephone, about the status of the Tribe's claim for refund, without any resolution.
- 25. In June, 2009, the Tribe contacted the Taxpayer Advocate Service of the IRS to seek assistance in getting its claim for refund processed. Mr. Dan Klugman of the Taxpayer Advocate Service office in Los Angeles, California was thereupon assigned to the Santa Ynez matter.

26.	In September, 2009, Mr. Klugman advised the Tribe's representative
that a Form	843 ("Claim For Refund and Request For Abatement") needed to be
filed for tax	years 2003 and 2004 in addition to the documents previously filed by
the Tribe.	

- 27. On or about September 18, 2009, the Tribe's representative submitted Forms 843 for years 2003 and 2004 (the "843 Forms") with other documentation to Mr. Klugman of the IRS, as requested. Copies of only the cover letter and the 843 Forms sent to Mr. Klugman on September 18, 2009 are attached hereto as Exhibit C.
- 28. The Tribe's claim for refund was subsequently denied by the IRS by letter dated February 3, 2010, sent by Mitchell Underwood of the Indian Tribal Government office of the IRS, San Bernardino, California. That letter gave the reason for denial as "[c]laim forms 843, Claim for Refund and Request for Abatement, for tax years 200312 and 200412, were received 10/13/2009. The statutory refund period expired May 10, 2008. Claims were fully disallowed." A copy of the IRS letter of denial is attached hereto as Exhibit D.

## **CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**

#### A. FIRST CLAIM

- 29. Santa Ynez realleges, as set forth fully herein, each and every allegation contained in the preceding paragraphs.
- 30. Santa Ynez's January 22<sup>nd</sup> Claim was filed well within the limitations period applicable to that claim and constituted, at a minimum, a valid and effective "informal claim" for tax refund within the meaning of that doctrine.
- 31. As a valid and effective "informal claim," the filing of the January 22<sup>nd</sup> Claim tolled the statute of limitations relative to that claim.
- 32. If the January 22<sup>nd</sup> Claim failed to meet any of the technical requirements of a valid claim for refund, any such defects or deficiencies were

1	(a) declaring that under the "informal claim" rule, the Tribe's claim						
2	for refund of taxes was timely filed and that the decision of the IRS to reject that						
3	claim as untimely was erroneous and unlawful;						
4	(b) ordering and directing the IRS to accept, consider and act upon						
5	the Tribe's timely filed claim for refund;						
6	(c) awarding the Tribe its costs of suit;						
7	(d) awarding the Tribe its reasonable attorneys fees to the extent						
8	provided by law; and						
9	(e) awarding the Tribe such other relief as the Court deems just and						
10	proper.						
11	DATED thisday of November, 2010.						
12	JENKINS & HOGIN, LLP						
13							
14	Lauren B. Feldman						
15	1230 Rosecrans Avenue, Suite 110						
16	Manhattan Beach, California 90266						
17							
18	MARISCAL WEEKS McINTYRE						
19	& FRIEDLANDER, P.A.						
20							
21	gen. Fild						
22	Glenn M. Feldman (Pro Hac Vice Application Pending)						
23	2901 N. Central Ave. Suite 200						
24	Phoenix, Arizona 85012  U:\ATTORNEYS\GMF\Santa Ynez\USA\Complaint 2.doc						
25	O.S. I.O.S. I. Sant. Sant. The Co.S. Companie 2.000						
26							
27							
28							