	Case 2:11-cv-00698-FJM Document	88 Filed 08/14/12 Page 1 of 4	
1			
1	KATHRYN KENEALLY Assistant Attorney General		
2	CHARLES M. DUFFY		
3	Trial Attorney, Tax Division U.S. Department of Justice		
4	P.O. Box 683 Ben Franklin Station		
5	Washington, D.C. 20044-0683 Telephone: (202) 307-6406		
6	Email: <u>charles.m.duffy@usdoj.gov</u> Western.taxcivil@usdoj.gov		
7	Attorneys for the United States of America		
8	JOHN S. LEONARDO United States Attorney		
9	District of Arizona Of Counsel		
10	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
11	DISTRICT OF ARIZONA		
12			
13	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	Civ. No. 11-0698-PHX-FJM	
14	Plaintiffs,		
15	V.		
16	JAMES LESLIE READING, CLARE L. READING, FOX GROUP TRUST,	UNITED STATES' OPPOSITION TO TERRY MAJOR'S EMERGENCY	
17	MIDFIRST BANK, CHASE, FINÁNCIAL LEGAL SERVICES, STATE OF ARIZONA	MOTION TO STAY PROCEEDINGS PENDING INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL	
18	Defendants.		
19	STATEMENT		
20	On August 9, 2012, Terry Major, who is the Trustee of the Fox Group Trust ("the trust"), filed		
21	a Notice of Appeal and an "Emergency Motion to Stay Proceedings Pending Interlocutory Appeal."		
22	Mr. Major's appeal relates to the District Court's July 3, 2012 order that struck his notice of		
23	appearance on behalf of the trust. Mr. Major's m	otion to reconsider the July 3, 2012 order was also	
24	denied by the District Court on July 26, 2012. Mr. Major is not an attorney and the District Court's		
25	order striking his notice of appearance is based on C.E. Pope Equity Trust v. United States, 818 F.2d		
26	696, 697 (9th Cir. 1987), which provides that tru	ists must be represented in federal court by duly-	

6655934.1

qualified counsel.

THE COURT SHOULD DENY THE MOTION FOR STAY

Mr. Major's motion for a stay should be denied for various reasons. As a preliminary matter, his notice of appeal does not appear to be proper since the July 3rd and July 26th orders are not final orders under 28 U.S.C. § 1291 in that the parties are still in the midst of litigating this case in the District Court. Also, the Court has not certified the orders for interlocutory appeal under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b) and 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b). Where there is no certification under Rule 54(b), there is no jurisdiction with the Court of Appeals. *See Hoonah Indian Ass'n v. Morrison*, 170 F.3d 1223, 1225 (9th Cir. 1999); *In re Brown*, 248 F.3d 484, 485-88 (6th Cir. 2001).

It should be noted also that there are no proper grounds upon which the District Court should certify the referenced orders under Rule 54(b) and 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b) since the orders do not involve controlling questions of law "as to which there is substantial ground for difference of opinion" and an immediate appeal from such orders would not "materially advance the ultimate termination of the litigation." *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b) and *Couch v. Telescope Inc. et al.*, 611 F.3d 629, 633 (9th Cir. 2010). In this regard, it is well established that a non-lawyer cannot represent a trust in federal court (*see e.g., C. E. Pope, supra.*). Further, an appeal of the subject orders will not advance the ultimate termination of the litigation since there are various other issues that need to be resolved (and that are being addressed) before the litigation in the District Court can be concluded.

There are also no grounds to stay this matter pending the resolution of Mr. Major's appeal since he has not shown (1) a probability of success on the merits concerning his argument that he should be allowed to represent the trust; (2) the possibility of irreparable injury; (3) that serious legal questions are raised; and (4) that the balance of hardships tips sharply in his favor. *See e.g., Andreiu v. Ashcroft*, 253 F.3d 477, 483 (9th Cir. 2001).

CONCLUSION

The Court should deny the motion to stay and decline to certify the July 3, 2012 and July 26,

	Case 2:11-cv-00698-FJM Documen	t 88 Filed 08/14/12 Page 3 of 4
1 2	2012 orders for interlocutory appeal. DATED this <u>14th</u> day of <u>August</u> , 2012.	
3		
4		KATHRYN KENEALLY Assistant Attorney General, Tax Division U.S. Department of Justice
5		0.5. Department of Justice
6 7	By:	<u>/s/ Charles M. Duffy</u> CHARLES M. DUFFY Trial Attorney, Tax Division
7		
8		Of Counsel:
9 10		JOHN S. LEONARDO United States Attorney
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		-3- 6655934.1

	Case 2:11-cv-00698-FJM Document 88 Filed 08/14/12 Page 4 of 4
1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
2	I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this <u>14th</u> day of August, 2012, I served the foregoing
3	through the Court's electronic filing system:
4	
5	ROBERT P. VENTRELLA Assistant Attorney General 1275 West Washington Street
6	Phoenix, Arizona 85007-2926
7	PAUL M. LEVINE, ESQUIRE
8	PAUL M. LEVINE, ESQUIRE LAKSHMI JAGANNATH, ESQUIRE McCarthy, Holthus, Levine Law Firm 8502 E. Via de Ventura, Suite 200
9	Scottsdale, Arizona 85258
10	TOMMY K. CRYER
11	Attorney at Law 7330 Fern Avenue Shraveport Louisiana 71105
12	Shreveport, Louisiana 71105 I also certify that on this 14 th day of August, 2012, I served the foregoing on the
13	undersigned by first class mail:
14	
15	James Leslie Reading Clare Louise Reading 2425 East Fox Street
16	Mesa, Arizona 85213
17	Fox Group Trust P. O. Box 2023
18	Cottonwood, Arizona 86326
19	
20	
21	<u>/s/ Charles M. Duffy</u> Charles M. Duffy
22	Trial Attorney, Tax Division U.S. Department of Justice
23	U.S. Department of Justice
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	6655934.1