

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Mathis v. County of Siskiyou

Mathis · No. 2:22-cv-1378 KJM AC · Decided July 25, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California denied Marshall Edward Mikels’ motion, construed as a motion to quash a subpoena and referred as a discovery motion. The court found that Mikels did not identify cognizable relief or present a non-frivolous legal argument, and rejected the document’s sovereign-citizen-related assertions.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Allison Claire
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	July 25, 2025
DOCKET	2:22-cv-1378 KJM AC
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Pro se nonparty Marshall Edward Mikels filed a document construed as a motion to quash a subpoena and, by referral, as a discovery-related motion.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential district court order
PARTIES	Russell Mathis, et al. v. County of Siskiyou, et al.

TOPICS

discovery dispute civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure discovery

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether Mikels's filing could be construed as a cognizable discovery-related motion or motion to quash a subpoena.

2. Whether the motion should be denied because it identified no relief the court could plausibly grant and presented only frivolous sovereign-citizen arguments.

HOLDINGS

1. The filing was noncognizable because Mikels did not identify any relief that the court could plausibly grant and did not appear to seek judicial relief.
2. Sovereign-citizen-style arguments provide no legal basis for relief, and a filing containing such arguments without a legal cause of action or nonfrivolous argument must be denied.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Marshall Edward Mikels, who was not mentioned in the operative complaint and whose connection to the case was unclear, filed a document purporting to stop the delivery or use of information concerning individuals allegedly connected with a subpoena. The document appeared to seek notification of individuals regarding the release of information or efforts to contact Mikels, rather than identifiable judicial relief. It also contained sovereign-citizen-style arguments and no cognizable legal cause of action.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Mikels first filed the document as a notice, and after refileing it, the Clerk construed it as a motion to quash a subpoena. The motion was referred to the magistrate judge as a discovery motion under Eastern District of California Local Rule 302(c)(1). The court denied it.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- U.S. v. Ward, 182 F.3d 930, at *2 (9th Cir. 1999)

OPINION

Mathis v. County of Siskiyou

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 RUSSELL MATHIS, et al, No. 2:22-cv-1378 KJM AC 12 Plaintiffs, 13 v. ORDER 14
COUNTY OF SISKIYOU, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 Before the court is pro se movant Marshall
Edward Mikels' motion, which the court 18 construes as a motion related to discovery. ECF No.
160. Mikels' connection to this case is 19 unclear; he is not mentioned in the Second Amended
Complaint (ECF No. 140). On July 2, 2025, 20 Mikels filed a document entitled "STOP NOTICE
STANDING NOTICE AND AFFIDAVIT TO

21 CEASE AND DESIST DELIVERY AND USE OF ANY INDIVIDUAL AND GROUP
22 INFORMATION FROM JOHN HILL AND LOUISE GLAITTO FROM THE PATRIOT
23 GROUP KNOWN AS THE SSCP AND NSCP/TEA PARTY IN PREFERENCE TO
24 SUBPEOA

25 IN CIVIL ACTION NO. 2-22-cv-01378 KJM-AC RENDERING THE INFORMATION VOID,
26 UNLAWFUL AND WITHOUT EFFECT. THIS NOTICE IS DONE ON BEHALF OF ALL
27 PEOPLE AND VOIDS ANY REQUIREMENT FOR THE ENTRY, INSPECTION OR TO
28 PRODUCE ANYTHING FOR ANY COURT, ATTORNEY OR LAW ENFORCEMENT.” ECF
29 No. 160. This document was construed by the Clerk of Court as a notice; it was not docketed as
a

1 | motion. On July 21, 2025, Mikels re-filed the same document. ECF No. 160. This time, the 2 ||
document was construed as a motion to quash a subpoena, and the motion is now before the 3 ||
undersigned. 4 The motion as presented is most analogous to a discovery motion and is therefore 5
|| construed as such. Accordingly, the motion is referred to the undersigned pursuant to Local Rule
6 || 302(c)(1). In the motion, Mikels asserts that on July 15, 2025, emails were delivered to John
Hill 7 || and Louise Gliatto inviting them to a meeting in which they could inform a group about
their 8 || intent to release information to the individuals connected with this case. ECF No. 160 at
3. 9 || Mikels appears to assert that Hill and Gliatto intend to release information to the court,
though it 10 || is not clear what the connection is between any of these individuals and the lawsuit
at bar. 1] Regardless of the connection between Mikels, Hill, Gliatto and this lawsuit, Mikels’ 12 ||
motion is noncognizable and must be denied. First, Mikels does not identify any relief that the 13 ||
court can plausibly grant. Indeed, Mikels does not appear to seek relief from the court at all; it 14 ||
appears he intends to notify individuals of his position regarding any release of his information or
15 || attempt to contact him. For this reason alone, the motion — to the extent it is a motion — is
cannot 16 || be granted. Second, the document filed by Mikels is replete with references to, or
similar to, 17 || sovereign citizen ideology. Such quasi-legal rhetoric has no basis in law and has
been repeatedly 18 || rejected by federal courts. See, e.g., U.S. v. Ward, 182 F.3d 930, at *2 (9th
Cir. 1999) (noting 19 | that contentions based on sovereign citizen arguments are “frivolous” and
that “courts ordinarily 20 || reject similar contentions without extended argument”). The document
does not contain any legal 21 || cause of action and does not present any non-frivolous argument.
For these reasons, Mikels’ 22 | motion (ECF No. 160) is DENIED. 23 IT IS SO ORDERED. 24 |
DATED: July 25, 2025 ~ Cttt0 Lhar—e_ 25 ALLISONCLAIRE.

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

27 28