

JOHN W. HUBER, United States Attorney (#7226)
JOHN K. MANGUM, Assistant United States Attorney (#2072)
185 South State Street, Suite 300
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Telephone: (801) 524-5682
Email: john.mangum@usdoj.gov

ERIN R. HINES, *pro hac vice*
FL Bar No. 44175, erin.r.hines@usdoj.gov
CHRISTOPHER R. MORAN, *pro hac vice*
NY Bar No. 5033832, christopher.r.moran@usdoj.gov
Trial Attorneys, Tax Division
U.S. Department of Justice
P.O. Box 7238
Ben Franklin Station
Washington, D.C. 20044
Telephone: (202) 353-2452

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
DISTRICT OF UTAH, CENTRAL DIVISION

<p>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,</p> <p>Plaintiff,</p> <p>vs.</p> <p>RAPOWER-3, LLC, INTERNATIONAL AUTOMATED SYSTEMS, INC., LTB1, LLC, R. GREGORY SHEPARD, NELDON JOHNSON, and ROGER FREEBORN,</p> <p>Defendants.</p>	<p>Civil No. 2:15-cv-00828 DN</p> <p>MOTION TO COMPEL INTERNATIONAL AUTOMATED SYSTEMS (IAS) TO SIGN AND SUPPLEMENT ITS RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S FIRST INTERROGATORIES</p> <p>Judge David Nuffer Magistrate Judge Brooke C. Wells</p>
---	---

The United States respectfully moves the Court for an order compelling International Automated Systems, Inc. (IAS) to (1) sign its responses to the United States' first interrogatories; and (2) supplement its responses to conform with Fed. R. Civ. P. 33.

The United States propounded its first interrogatories to IAS on April 8, 2016. (Exhibit A.¹) Pursuant to agreement of the parties, IAS's responses were due on May 27, 2016. IAS's attorney, Mr. Justin Heideman, provided a response on May 27, 2016. (Exhibit B.) On June 2, 2016, the United States sent Mr. Heideman a letter requesting that IAS supplement its responses addressing the following deficiencies (Exhibit C):

1. IAS did not sign the responses under oath. Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(b)(3).
2. Some responses were incomplete, non-responsive and appeared to be in draft form. *See, i.e.*, Interrogatory No. 1 (draft form), 2 (draft form/non-responsive), 3 (non-responsive), 4 (non-responsive), 14 (non-responsive and incomplete), 15 (non-responsive and incomplete), 16 (non-responsive), 17 (non-responsive), 18 (non-responsive).

For example, IAS is a publicly traded company with reporting obligations to the SEC. It is nonsensical that IAS is unable to identify its officers and owners (Interrogatory Nos. 1 & 2), suggesting that IAS has not made any good faith attempt to respond to the United States' interrogatories.

3. IAS improperly refrained from answering the interrogatories until the Court enters a protective order or the parties sign a non-disclosure agreement. *See* Interrogatory Nos. 10 & 11.

The parties agreed that until the Court resolved the pending dispute regarding a protective order (Doc. Nos. 39, 41, 44 & 50), the defendants could refrain from

¹ The United States attached several exhibits to its First Interrogatories. The exhibits are omitted because they are not germane to the issues raised in this motion, however the exhibits can be provided to the Court upon request.

producing information they believed would be subject to any applicable protective order. Such information generally includes sensitive technical, business or competitive information or other information that a producing party “reasonably and in good faith believes would likely cause harm.” (D. Utah Standard Protective Order, Fed. R. Civ. P. 26).

The United States’ interrogatories sought information from defendants relating to their sale of solar lenses, systems, and components including the product they purport to produce (No. 10) and when these items were placed in service (No. 11). IAS has previously admitted that it, directly or indirectly, sells solar lenses to customers through a multi-level marketing model and that RaPower-3 provides tax letters prepared by Anderson Law Center and Kirton & McConkie to customers. (Doc. No. 22, ¶¶ 24, 36, 42). IAS refused to answer several interrogatories until a protective order is in place despite the fact defendants already share the information with customers and publish it on their websites. The information is not “sensitive” or “competitive” business or technical information, and has not been treated as confidential. Refusing to respond in reliance on the claim that this information will be protected is disingenuous at best.

CERTIFICATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH FED. R. CIV. P. 37(a)(1) & COURT’S SHORT FORM DISCOVERY MOTION PROCEDURE (Doc. No. 40.):

The United States made reasonable efforts to resolve this dispute, including:

- 1) On June 2, 2016, counsel for the United States sent Mr. Heideman a letter noting several deficiencies in the response and requesting that Mr. Heideman meet and confer on the matter; and
- 2) On June 14, 2016, at approximately 1:00pm (Eastern Daylight Time) and 11:00pm (Mountain Daylight Time) counsel for the United States (Erin R. Hines & Christopher R. Moran) spoke with Mr. Heideman via telephone about several pending discovery matters, including IAS's deficient responses. Mr. Heideman agreed to provide a supplement no later than June 17, 2016. To date, the United States has not received a supplemental response.

Dated: June 22, 2016

/s/ Christopher R. Moran
CHRISTOPHER R. MORAN
New York Bar No. 5033832
Email: christopher.r.moran@usdoj.gov
ERIN R. HINES
FL Bar No. 44175
Email: erin.r.hines@usdoj.gov
Telephone: (202) 307-0834
Telephone: (202) 514-6619
Trial Attorneys, Tax Division
U.S. Department of Justice
P.O. Box 7238
Ben Franklin Station
Washington, D.C. 20044
FAX: (202) 514-6770
**ATTORNEYS FOR THE
UNITED STATES**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on June 22, 2016, The foregoing document was electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court through the CM/ECF system, which sent notice of the electronic filing to the following:

Justin D. Heideman
HEIDEMAN & ASSOCIATES
2696 North University Avenue, Suite 180
Provo, Utah 84604
jheideman@heidlaw.com
**ATTORNEY FOR RAPOWER-3, LLC,
INTERNATIONAL AUTOMATED SYSTEMS, INC.,
LTB1, LLC, and NELDON JOHNSON**

Donald S. Reay
MILLER, REAY & ASSOCIATES
donald@reaylaw.com
**ATTORNEY FOR R. GREGORY SHEPARD
AND ROGER FREEBORN**