

UNCLASSIFIED//FOUO

282B-WF-2896615

Continuation of FD-302 of Interview of [redacted], On 07/09/2013, Page 4 of 7

for the addition to the BOLO. No one said anything at the time or raised any concerns about the Tea Party being added to the list. As mentioned previously, revenue agents were expected to know what was on the BOLO. Their managers may know as well, or the managers may lean on their agents' knowledge for what is on the list. [redacted] does not remember when the Tea Party issue was first raised, but it would have been when it was first put on the BOLO.

b6 -2  
b7C -2

Case Chronology Reports (CCR) are non-disclosable work papers for each case. Checking the BOLO was part of the CCR. Agents could also put checking the BOLO, as required per the Internal Revenue Manual (IRM), as part of the case timeline.

Group 7822 was composed of 12 to 15 people and was simply a place for the Tea Party cases to be held in inventory while the agent waited to receive guidance from the Washington office. There had been no precedence previously on these issues. [redacted] is not sure when the issue was forwarded up the management chain, but he was probably told by his Area Manager, most likely [redacted] to hold the cases. If the case said it supports politics and political activity it would be put into Group 7822. [redacted] and then [redacted] held the cases in their inventory.

b6 -2,3  
b7C -2,3

Guidance on how to work the cases did not come down until after [redacted] left Group 7822. He asked his management chain once a month or every other month whether there was guidance or not. Since the Area Manager changed a lot he is not sure who he was communicating this with. He may have off and on had some conversations with [redacted] about when the guidance was expected. In his experience, getting guidance from Washington takes a while; but this seemed to take longer. It was typical for cases to sit and wait until they got guidance on how to apply the tax law.

b6 -2,3  
b7C -2,3

[redacted] was shown an e-mail chain dated June 1 to 2, 2011 (bates 92 to 93). [redacted] does not remember the e-mails. HOLLY PAZ was [redacted] manager. [redacted] was one of the Area Managers. [redacted] had heard of [redacted] in general, maybe from the media or work. He would not typically follow up on e-mail exchanges where he was on the "Cc:" line unless it was sent to his employee.

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

[redacted] was shown an e-mail dated June 2, 2011 (bates 48 to 49) where four issues are listed as indicators of potential "tea party" cases. Since he was on the "Cc:" line of the e-mail he does not recall it, but this e-mail may have led to a description change for the Tea Party cases. He does not recall discussions about the four topics listed for Tea Party/advocacy identification.

b6 -2  
b7C -2

[redacted] is not aware of any memorandums or e-mails other than the BOLO

UNCLASSIFIED//FOUO