

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

LINCHPINS OF LIBERTY, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

UNITED STATES, et al.,

Defendants.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

Civil Action No. 13-777 (RBW)

ORDER

The parties in this civil action appeared before the Court on August 15, 2017, for a hearing on the Plaintiffs' Motion to Clarify Order Granting Discovery, Compel Discovery Responses, and Extend Discovery Deadline and Memorandum in Support, ECF No. 131. In accordance with the oral rulings made by the Court during the motions hearing, it is hereby

ORDERED that the Plaintiffs' Motion to Clarify Order Granting Discovery, Compel Discovery Responses, and Extend Discovery Deadline and Memorandum in Support, ECF No. 131, is **GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART**. Specifically, the motion is **GRANTED** with respect to (1) the plaintiffs' requests to clarify the Court's April 12, 2017 Order ("Limited Discovery Order") and to compel the government to respond to the plaintiffs' interrogatories and requests for productions to the extent that the government is required to respond to the interrogatories and document request listed below and (2) the plaintiffs' request to extend the discovery deadline in this case by sixty days. However, the motion is **DENIED** with respect to the plaintiffs' request for the Court to compel the government to respond to their requests for admissions. It is further

ORDERED that, for the parties' clarification, the Court, consistent with its Limited

Discovery Order, considers the subject matter of the following interrogatories and document request to cover the limited discovery the plaintiffs are entitled to receive from the government:

Interrogatories

1. What information is generally required from entities seeking tax-exempt status?
2. Why was tax-exempt status requested by the plaintiffs (all 38 individually) delayed based on the information required?
3. Why did the information provided by the plaintiffs (explain as to each) in response to the requests for additional information further delay the granting of the plaintiffs' applications for tax-exempt status?
4. Who were the IRS employees involved in the decisions that resulted in the delays in granting the plaintiffs tax-exempt status?
5. What actions have been taken by the IRS to redress the alleged discrimination the plaintiffs experienced in having their applications expeditiously processed?
6. What actions were taken, if any, in regards to the plaintiffs' tax-exempt status, by the IRS after tax-exempt status was granted to the plaintiffs beyond the monitoring normally conducted of entities awarded tax-exempt status?

Document Request

1. All documents containing information related to the six interrogatories.

The government is required to search for responsive documents in its Custodian Database and all other relevant resources containing documents from the relevant time period, which is from May 2009, the earliest that any plaintiff had an application for tax exempt status pending, to March 27, 2015, the date on which the 2015 TIGTA Report was issued. Furthermore, to the extent that the plaintiffs have already received information produced by the government indicating that the plaintiffs were allegedly discriminated against, and that information provides a basis to believe that other such documents exist, the government must search all relevant sources to ensure that all documents responsive to the document request is identified and produced. It is further

ORDERED that the limited discovery afforded in this case shall close on October 16,

2017. It is further

ORDERED that the post-discovery status conference previously scheduled for August 22, 2017, is **CONTINUED** to October 18, 2017, at 2:30 p.m.

SO ORDERED this 17th day of August, 2017.

REGGIE B. WALTON
United States District Judge