

FD-302a (Rev. 05-08-10)

282B-WF-2896615

Continuation of FD-302 of Interview of [REDACTED], On 07/29/2013, Page 2 of 6

b6 -2
b7C -2

cases, he spent 100% of his time working auto revocation cases. He received a few 100 auto revocation cases per week. When the auto revocation process began, approximately 250,000 cases were immediately revoked. Approximately 50,000 cases per week were revoked after that. [REDACTED] conducted the secondary screening of cases over three years old. He would either close the cases or send them to Development.

b6 -2
b7C -2

[REDACTED] provided the Tea party cases to [REDACTED] and told him they were awaiting guidance from DC on how to conduct the cases. [REDACTED] received between 50 and 100 existing Tea Party cases from [REDACTED]. Approximately 12 of those cases had development letters in them.

b6 -2,3
b7C -2,3

[REDACTED] had been working with [REDACTED] in DC. [REDACTED] was supposed to be providing them guidance on how to work the cases. [REDACTED] sent [REDACTED] a few sample development letters and provided him with a short briefing on the cases. [REDACTED] was told by [REDACTED] to hold the cases and if applicants called for a status update, he should tell them their cases were under review. He received additional new cases over the next year. If a new Tea Party case came in, [REDACTED] would log it on the "Be on the Lookout" (BOLO) list and spreadsheet.

b6 -2,3
b7C -2,3

[REDACTED] called [REDACTED] a few times to see when the guidance for working the Tea Party cases would be issued. After that time, he let his management chain address the issue.

b6 -2,3
b7C -2,3

[REDACTED] was tasked to do one development letter in 2011 or 2012. He wrote this letter a week before TIGTA came in and conducted interviews. The applicant was [REDACTED] from the [REDACTED] group. [REDACTED] was a former IRS employee who had retired from [REDACTED] department and went to work for the Tea Party. [REDACTED] did not consult any guidance when drafting this letter. [REDACTED] believes the letter was approved. The applicant answered the letter and [REDACTED] was able to recommend approval. No other development letters were going out at that time because they were awaiting guidance from DC on whether the Tea Party groups were exempt or not.

b3 -1
b6 -2,3
b7C -2,3

In the 14-month period when [REDACTED] had the cases, he would ask for updates on guidance and was told they were still waiting on DC. He recalls receiving emails with contradictory guidance on whether the 501 (c)(3) or 501 (c)(4) cases should be denied. It was his understanding that a team would come and work the Tea Party cases when the guidance was provided.

When he received the cases and they met the criteria on the BOLO, he would log them in. He received daily or weekly calls from applicants on the status of their applications. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] both wanted to move the Tea Party cases forward. [REDACTED] was frustrated. Nobody told him directly where the delay was in resolving the Tea Party issue. DC is like a black hole. He does not know who would have made the decision on the Tea

b6 -2,3
b7C -2,3