

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

John W. Williams v. Beer, et al.

John W. Williams v. Beer, No. 1:21-cv-00155-KES-EPG (PC) (E.D. Cal. Oct. 30, 2025) · No. 1:21-cv-00155-KES-EPG (PC) · Decided October 31, 2025

SUMMARY

The Eastern District of California denied without prejudice defendants’ motion to enforce a subpoena seeking records from Dr. Brandi Mathews. The court held that under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 45, any motion to compel compliance must be brought in the district where compliance is required; because the subpoena designated an address in Los Angeles, the Central District of California was the proper venue.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	October 31, 2025
DOCKET	1:21-cv-00155-KES-EPG (PC)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants moved to enforce a subpoena seeking records from nonparty Dr. Brandi Mathews.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure
- subject matter jurisdiction

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- federal civil procedure
- subpoenas

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the Eastern District of California had authority under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 45 to enforce a subpoena requiring document production in Los Angeles, California.
- Whether defendants' motion to enforce should be denied without prejudice because the place of compliance was outside the district.

HOLDINGS

1. Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 45(d)(2)(B)(i), a motion to compel production under a subpoena must be brought in the district where compliance is required.
2. A motion to enforce a subpoena must be denied without prejudice when the subpoena requires compliance outside the issuing court's district.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Because the place of compliance is not in this District, Defendants’ motion (ECF No. 115) is DENIED without prejudice.” (at 1)

“Rule 45 consistently, through numerous sections of the Rule, requires any motions or applications related to a subpoena be brought in the district where compliance is required” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Defendants sought records from Dr. Brandi Mathews, who had been retained by plaintiff to prepare an expert report used in support of a mental-health-diversion plea in a related criminal case. The subpoena required production at Ace Imaging Technologies, Inc., in Los Angeles, California. Because Los Angeles is in the Central District of California rather than the Eastern District, the court concluded that the motion was brought in the wrong district.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

In this federal prisoner civil-rights action, defendants moved to enforce a subpoena for records from Dr. Mathews. The Eastern District of California denied the motion without prejudice because the subpoena required compliance at an address in Los Angeles, which lies in the Central District of California.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Pizana v. Basic Rsch., LLC, 2022 WL 1693317, at *2–3 (E.D. Cal. May 26, 2022)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9 10 JOHN W. WILLIAMS, Case No. 1:21-cv-00155-KES-EPG (PC) 11 Plaintiff, ORDER
DENYING DEFENDANTS’ 12 MOTION TO ENFORCE A SUBPOENA v. ISSUED TO DR.
MATHEWS WITHOUT 13 PREJUDICE BEER, et al., 14 Defendants. (ECF No. 115) 15 16 17
Before the Court is Defendants’ motion to enforce a subpoena for records requested from 18 Dr.
Brandi Mathews, “who was retained by Plaintiff to prepare an expert report that was 19 submitted

to the court in support of his mental health diversion plea in his related criminal case.” (ECF No. 115, p. 1).

20 Notably, the subpoena at issue requires production of documents at the following address: 21 Ace Imaging Technologies, Inc. 22 800 S. Figueroa Street 900 Los Angeles, CA 90017 23 (ECF No. 116, at p. 2). 24 Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 45(d)(2)(B)(i), if a non-party objects to a 25 subpoena, “at any time, on notice to the commanded person, the serving party may move the 26 court for the district where compliance is required for an order compelling production or 27 inspection.” (Emphasis added).

See *Pizana v. Basic Rsch., LLC*, No. 1:18-CV-00644-DAD-SKO, 28 1 | 2022 WL 1693317, at *2 —3 (E.D. Cal. May 26, 2022) (“Rule 45 consistently, through numerous 2 || sections of the Rule, requires any motions or applications related to a subpoena be brought in the 3 || district where compliance is required.... when a motion to quash a subpoena is filed in a court 4 | other than the court where compliance is required, that court lacks jurisdiction to resolve the 5 motion.”).

6 Here, the subpoena requires the production of documents at an address in Los Angeles, 7 California, which is in the Central District of California. (ECF No. 116, p. 2). 8 Because the place of compliance is not in this District, Defendants’ motion (ECF No. 115) 9 is DENIED without prejudice.

The Clerk of Court is ordered to mail a copy of this order to Dr. Brandi Mathews, 10333 El Camino Real, Atascadero, CA 93422. 12 | IT IS ORDERED. 13 Dated: _ October 30, 2025 [spe ey
□□ 14 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28