[NOT FOR PUBLICATION-NOT TO BE CITED AS PRECEDENT]

United States Court of AppealsFor the First Circuit

No. 01-2135

JAMES E. ANDERSON; CHERYL J. LATOS,
Plaintiffs, Appellants,

V.

UNITED STATES,

Defendant, Appellee.

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

[Hon. Mary M. Lisi, <u>U.S. District Judge</u>]

Before

Lynch, <u>Circuit Judge</u>, Campbell and Stahl, <u>Senior Circuit Judges</u>.

James E. Anderson and Cheryl J. Latos on brief pro se.

<u>Eileen J. O'Connor</u>, Assistant Attorney General, <u>Kenneth L.</u>

<u>Greene</u> and <u>A. Wray Muoio</u>, Attorneys, Tax Division, Department of Justice, and <u>Margaret E. Curran</u>, United States Attorney, on brief for appellee.

MARCH 14, 2002

 $\underline{\text{Per Curiam}}$. After carefully reviewing the briefs and record on appeal, we $\underline{\text{affirm}}$ the decision below.

The appellants' central contention is that Treas. Reg. § 31.3102-1(c) does not provide adequate authority for collecting the employee portion of FICA taxes from them. Contrary to the appellants' argument, however, IRS has rule-making authority for FICA taxes, and the regulations are afforded the usual deference. <u>United States</u> v. <u>Cleveland Indians Baseball Co.</u>, 532 U.S. 200, 121 S. Ct. 1433 (2001).

The appellants' remaining arguments fail for substantially the reasons stated by the district court at the hearing.

Affirmed. Loc. R. 27(c).