

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Case Number: 11-mc-61200-WPD

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

RONALD JEROME SCRIVEN;  
DANESA L. WEBB; and TAMIJAH  
INTERNATIONAL LLC, d/b/a T.I. TAX SERVICE,

Defendants.

---

**DEFAULT JUDGMENT AND PERMANENT INJUNCTION  
AGAINST DEFENDANT DANESA L. WEBB**

This matter comes before the Court on the United States' Motion for Default Judgment and Permanent Injunction Against Defendant Danesa L. Webb. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 58(a), the Court enters this separate final judgment.

Having reviewed the record in this case, the Court makes the following findings of fact and conclusions of law and enters this permanent injunction against Danesa L. Webb.

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. The United States brought this action under §§ 7402, 7407 and 7408 of the Internal Revenue Code, 26 U.S.C. (the "Code"). Jurisdiction is proper under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1340 and 1345, and Code §§ 7402(a), 7407 and 7408. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because defendant Danesa L. Webb resides or conducts business in this district and because a substantial part of the actions giving rise to this suit took place in this district.
2. Danesa L. Webb resides and conducts business in Broward County, Florida.
3. Defendant Tamijah International LLC ("T.I.") is located and conducts business in Broward County, Florida. It was formed and registered by defendant Ronald Jerome Scriven

and Webb as a limited liability company with the State of Florida in August 2007. According to its Articles of Organization, Scriven and Webb are its managing members/managers. Scriven and Webb told IRS agents in a November 19, 2009, interview that Webb owns T.I. and Scriven operates it as manager.

4. T.I. sometimes conducts business as T.I. Tax Service.

#### Webb's Activities

5. Webb is a tax return preparer as defined by Code § 7701(a)(36). She prepares other people's federal tax returns for compensation.

6. Webb is an experienced tax return preparer who has prepared returns since at least 2008. She got into the tax return preparation business through her friend Scriven.

7. Webb conducts a tax return preparation business using T.I.

8. According to Scriven and Webb, the defendants' fees range from \$30 to \$400 for preparing an individual's federal income tax return. However, according to customers, the defendants often charged thousands of dollars to prepare a simple tax return for a customer.

9. Webb targeted and victimized unsuspecting distressed individuals with the promise of quick and easy cash. Many of Webb's customers were homeless and had no income. Webb, or her agents, falsely told individuals that the individuals were eligible for special credits or funds offered by the federal government. In order to receive the funds, Webb stated that the individuals must provide her with the individual's name and social security number. Webb would then prepare a federal income tax return for the individual that reported income, expense and credit information that Webb would wholly fabricate. This led to IRS tax refunds issued to the individuals with Webb taking a sizable portion of the refund as a fee.

10. Webb would oftentimes procure a person's identification information and prepare

and file a federal income tax return without that person's knowledge or authorization.

11. Webb prepared and filed federal income tax returns that she knew contained false claims for the First-Time Homebuyer Credit, false income and expense items, including Schedule C information that Webb fabricated, false education credits, and false claims for the Recovery Rebate Credit.

*False Claims for the First-Time Homebuyer Credit  
& Exorbitant Preparation Fee Demands*

12. As a means to strengthen the real estate market and help the economy, Congress enacted the First-Time Homebuyer Credit ("the Credit") in July 2008. The Credit allowed first-time homebuyers a credit against their federal income tax of the lesser of ten percent of the home's purchase price or \$8,000.

13. The Credit, which is codified at Code § 36, is claimed by completing and attaching to the income tax return an IRS Form 5405. Form 5405 sets forth the requirements for Credit eligibility. Form 5405 requires the preparer to list the purchased home's address and acquisition date.

14. To be eligible for the Credit (as in effect for tax year 2008) a person must not have owned a home in the previous three years and must have actually purchased a home after April 8, 2008.

15. The Internal Revenue Service has identified 300 returns prepared by the defendants for tax year 2008 that claimed the Credit. The IRS has reviewed over 100 of those returns and determined that none of the taxpayers was entitled to claim the Credit.

16. Scriven is identified as the preparer on 158 of the 300 returns that claimed the Credit, and Webb is identified as the preparer on 66 of the returns. The remaining 76 returns contain an incorrect preparer identification number so it is unknown whether Scriven, Webb or another T.I.

worker prepared those returns.

17. Webb made no attempt to determine whether customers were qualified to claim the Credit. She simply claimed the Credit on customers' returns without making any inquiries as to whether a home had been purchased, the purchase price or purchase date. Webb claimed the Credit on returns she prepared without any basis that the customers had purchased a home during the applicable time period or were otherwise eligible for the Credit.

18. The defendants participated in a program known as the Federal Refund Transfer Program offered by Santa Barbara Tax Products Group, LLC ("Santa Barbara"), a division of Pacific Capital Bank, N.A. When a return preparer participates in this program, the tax refunds associated with the returns are sent by the IRS to a bank account at Santa Barbara. Santa Barbara would deduct its fees (around \$200) and transfer the preparer's fee (typically around \$200) to the preparer's separate account. The program then allowed the preparer to print out the customer's net refund check, which was drawn on a Santa Barbara account and not the U.S. Treasury. The preparer was responsible for delivering the refund check to the customer.

19. The Santa Barbara program thus enabled the defendants to have a portion of their fees deducted automatically from the customers' refund checks and gave the defendants control over the distribution of the customers' tax refund checks.

20. Because the refund checks would be sent to the preparer's address, and not to the customer's, the address shown on the tax return did not have to be accurate. Participation in Santa Barbara's program enabled Webb to fabricate taxpayer addresses and home purchase addresses for the purpose of claiming the First-Time Homebuyer Credit, and it allowed Webb to gain possession of the refund checks.

21. Moreover, when Webb delivered the refund checks to customers, she would demand

that the customers give her a further significant portion—oftentimes more than half--of the funds as a further fee. And because the customers were frequently unaware that Webb had prepared and filed a return on their behalf, and because the refund check was not a U.S. Treasury check, the customers had no knowledge that the check represented a tax refund.

*False Schedule C Preparation*

22. In addition to preparing returns that falsely claimed the First-Time Homebuyer Credit, Webb prepared returns that included a fictitious Schedule C. A Schedule C is a tax form meant for individuals to report income and expenses from their self-proprietorships. The profit or loss shown on the Schedule C is reported on an individual's Form 1040.

23. Armed only with a customer's name and social security number, Webb created false Schedule C forms to understate the customer's federal tax liability. Without any input whatsoever from customers, Webb would list false businesses on the customers' returns, and report fabricated and fictitious income and expense items on the returns.

*Other Misconduct*

24. Webb also prepared and filed federal tax returns that contained other abuses. For example, she prepared and filed returns that falsely claimed the Recovery Rebate Credit.

25. The Recovery Rebate Credit was a one-time refundable credit related to the 2008 economic stimulus payments made to taxpayers. It was meant for those persons who did not receive the full economic stimulus payment in 2008 and whose circumstances had changed thus later making them eligible for some or all of the unpaid portion.

26. In order to determine eligibility for the Recovery Rebate Credit and to compute its correct amount, the amount of the 2008 economic stimulus payment received by the taxpayer must be known. Webb would claim the Recovery Rebate Credit (\$600 for individuals and

\$1,200 for couples filing jointly) on returns she prepared without making any inquiries into how much of the stimulus payment had been received by the taxpayer.

27. Webb would sometimes falsely claim the Recovery Rebate Credit in the exact amount of taxes owed (as reported on Line 61 of the Form 1040). The Recovery Rebate Credit would therefore offset any taxes reported as owed and would allow the falsely claimed First-Time Homebuyer Credit to be the amount of the taxpayer's refund.

28. Webb also knowingly claimed false education credits on returns she prepared. An education credit (such as the American Opportunity Credit or the Hope Credit) may be taken by individuals with a certain income level who incurred tuition or other post-secondary education fees. Webb claimed an education credit (up to \$2,500) on returns she prepared without making any inquiries of customers or without any basis. None of the customers for whom Webb claimed an education credit was entitled to the credit, and none of the customers provided Webb with information that would support an education credit. Webb also failed to attach to the returns she prepared that claimed the credit a Form 8863, the form used to support an education credit.

29. Webb usually would not provide customers with a copy of the return she prepared on the customers' behalf. The customers were often unaware that Webb had prepared their tax returns.

30. Webb prepared and filed federal tax returns that did not contain the correct preparer identification number ("PIN"). The PIN shown on the return did not match the person who was listed on the return as the preparer.

31. In addition, an incorrect employer identification number (EIN) for T.I. was used on the vast majority of the returns the defendants prepared and filed.

32. Out of the 124 returns prepared by the defendants that the IRS has examined, on at

least 41 occasions the defendants prepared and filed returns on behalf of customers who were employed and received Form W-2 wages. Employers had withheld taxes on these persons' wages. On each of those occasions, the defendants failed to report either the W-2 wages or the withheld taxes on the customer's return. Instead, the defendants prepared returns that contained false income and expense items on phoney Schedule C's and erroneously claimed the First-Time Homebuyer Credit.

33. In other words, since 2007 Webb has been preparing and filing federal tax returns that have had no basis in reality.

34. Webb fabricated an income tax return for Hollywood, Florida, resident Cruz Palacios. Palacios is disabled and unemployed. According to Palacios, she met Webb in early 2009 when Webb was soliciting customers in Palacios's housing complex. Webb told Palacios that she was from T.I. Tax Service and was offering to help people qualify for a loan or apply for a credit offered by the Obama administration. Webb gave Palacios some papers to fill out with personal identification information. Webb made no reference to a tax return.

35. A couple of months later, Webb called Palacios and stated that she had a \$7,800 check for Palacios. When Palacios met with Webb to get the check, which was drawn on Santa Barbara Bank, Webb told Palacios that her fee was half of the check and that she would go with Palacios to cash it. Webb was accompanied by two men at the time. According to Palacios, she felt intimidated by the situation, so she cashed the check and gave \$4,000 to Webb.

36. Without Palacios's permission or knowledge, Webb had prepared a 2008 federal income tax return for Palacios. Except for Palacios's identifying information, everything on the return was incorrect and fabricated by Webb. The return erroneously claimed an \$8,000 First-Time Homebuyer's Credit, a \$348 Recovery Rebate Credit, and a completely false Schedule C

that listed Palacios's business as "Red Barn Catering SE" and falsely reported income of \$12,417 from that purported business. The return prepared by Webb and filed by T.I. Tax Service fraudulently claimed a refund due of \$8,000 (which is now owed by Palacios to the IRS). Webb and the defendants did not provide Palacios with a copy of the return.

*Harm Caused by the Misconduct*

37. The 124 false or fraudulent returns prepared by defendants that have been reviewed by the IRS erroneously claim refunds that total over \$845,000. The IRS has determined tax deficiencies totaling more than \$1 million in its review of those returns. The IRS has yet to identify a return prepared by the defendants that was proper and did not need adjustments.

38. The government has incurred the expense of conducting the investigation of Webb's fraudulent return preparation. Webb's activities harm the United States because the IRS must devote its limited resources to identifying her customers, ascertaining the customers' correct tax liabilities, recovering any refunds erroneously issued, and collecting any additional taxes and penalties.

39. In reliance on Webb's services, customers have failed to file proper federal income tax returns, which has either deprived the customers of proper tax refunds to which they may have been entitled, or deprived the United States of additional tax revenue owed by the customers.

40. Webb's fraudulent activities do her customers no favors. The customers have suffered harm because they paid Webb exorbitant fees to prepare tax returns that are completely false. Moreover, the false tax returns prepared and submitted by Webb result in the assessment of taxes, interest and penalties against the customers. The customers face large liabilities as a result of Webb's conduct.



41. In addition to the direct monetary harm caused by preparing false or fraudulent returns, Webb's activities undermine public confidence in the administration of the federal tax system and encourage noncompliance with the internal revenue laws.

42. The United States filed its Complaint for Permanent Injunction and Other Relief on May 23, 2011, and copies of the complaint and summons were served on Webb on August 4, 2011. Webb has failed to answer the complaint. Default was entered against her by the Clerk of Court on August 29, 2011.

43. Webb is neither incompetent, an infant, nor on active military duty.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

44. Code § 7407 authorizes a court to enjoin a tax return preparer if, *inter alia*, the court finds that the return preparer has engaged in conduct subject to penalty under Code §§ 6694 or 6695, and that injunctive relief is appropriate to prevent the recurrence of the conduct.

45. Code § 6694(b) imposes penalties on a tax return preparer who willfully attempts to understate the tax liability of another person or whose reckless or intentional disregard of rules and regulations results in the understatement of the tax liability. Webb continually and repeatedly engaged in conduct subject to penalty under Code § 6694(b) by preparing returns that she knows understate the liabilities of her customers. Webb's misconduct includes preparing returns that she knows contain erroneous claims for the First Time Homebuyer Credit and false income and expense items.

46. Code § 6109(a) requires a preparer to include his proper identification number on the returns he prepares. Code § 6695(c) imposes penalties on preparers who fail to furnish the preparer's correct identification number on a return. Webb engaged in conduct subject to penalty under Code § 6695(c) by failing to include the correct preparer identification number on

returns she prepared.

47. Code § 6107(a) requires that a preparer provide a completed copy of the return to each customer. Code § 6695(a) imposes penalties on preparers who fail to provide a copy of a completed return to customers. Webb engaged in conduct subject to penalty under Code § 6695(a) by failing to provide to customers a completed copy of the returns she prepared.

48. Injunctive relief is appropriate to prevent this misconduct because, absent an injunction, Webb is likely to continue preparing and filing false federal income tax returns of the type described in this order, and to continue to fail to furnish proper identification numbers on returns they prepare, and to continue to fail to keep adequate customers records and furnish adequate customer information to the IRS on request.

49. Webb should be permanently enjoined under Code § 7407 from acting as a tax return preparer. Her repeated and continual conduct subject to injunction under Code § 7407 demonstrates that a narrower injunction prohibiting specific misconduct would be insufficient to prevent her interference with the proper administration of the internal revenue laws.

50. Code § 7408 authorizes courts to enjoin any person from engaging in conduct that is subject to penalty under Code § 6701 if injunctive relief is appropriate to prevent recurrence of that conduct.

51. Code § 6701(a) penalizes any person who aids or assists in the preparation of any portion of a federal tax return or other document knowing that it will be used in connection with any material matter arising under the internal revenue laws and knowing that if it is so used it would result in an understatement of another person's tax liability. Webb has prepared federal tax returns and related documents for others knowing that the returns and documents improperly claim the First-Time Homebuyer Credit, Recovery Rebate Credit, and education credits, and

contain false income and expense items thus understating the customers' correct federal tax liability. Her conduct is subject to penalty under Code § 6701. Unless enjoined by the Court, Webb is likely to continue to prepare tax returns that she knows will result in the understatement of tax liability.

52. Accordingly, Webb should be enjoined under Code § 7408 from engaging in conduct subject to penalty under Code § 6701.

53. Code § 7402 authorizes courts to issue injunctions "as may be necessary or appropriate for the enforcement of the internal revenue laws." The remedies available to the United States under that statute "are in addition to and not exclusive of any and all other penalties." Code § 7402(a). Defendant Webb, through the actions described above, has engaged in conduct that substantially interferes with the administration and enforcement of the internal revenue laws, and is likely to continue to engage in such conduct unless enjoined. The defendant's conduct is causing irreparable injury to the United States and an injunction under Code § 7402(a) is necessary and appropriate. If Webb is not enjoined from preparing tax returns the United States will suffer irreparable injury by erroneously providing tax refunds to persons not entitled to receive them and by taxpayers not reporting and paying the correct amount of taxes.

54. Unless Webb is enjoined, the IRS will have to devote substantial time and resources to identify and locate her customers, and then examine those customers' tax returns and property records. Pursuing all individual customers may be impossible given the IRS's limited resources. In addition to the harm caused by the defendant's preparation of false income tax returns, the defendant's activities undermine confidence in the administration of the federal tax system and encourage noncompliance with the internal revenue laws. Enjoining Webb is in the public

interest because an injunction will stop her illegal conduct and the harm it causes the United States.

55. Injunctive relief under Code §§ 7402(a), 7407 and 7408, is therefore appropriate and necessary.

### **INJUNCTION ORDER**

Based on the above findings and for good cause shown, the United States' Motion for Default Judgment and Permanent Injunction Against Defendant Danesa L. Webb is GRANTED. Accordingly,

**IT IS ORDERED** that Danesa L. Webb, and any entity through which she conducts business and all persons and entities in active concert or participation with her, are enjoined and restrained from, directly or indirectly:


- a. Preparing or filing, or assisting in the preparation or filing of, any federal tax return or other related document and form for any other person or entity; and
- b. Engaging in conduct subject to penalty under 26 U.S.C. §§ 6694, 6695 and 6701; and
- c. Engaging in other conduct that substantially interferes with the proper administration and enforcement of the internal revenue laws.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the United States is authorized to engage in post-judgment discovery pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure in order to monitor compliance with the terms of this injunction order.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that this Court shall retain jurisdiction over this action to ensure that this judgment is implemented and enforced as herein provided.

**DONE AND SIGNED** in Chambers at Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Florida, this

16 day of September, 2011.

  
WILLIAM P. DIMITROULEAS  
United States District Judge