

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.

OPINION

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 SUBPEOA 24 IN CIVIL ACTION NO. 2-22-cv-01378 KJM-AC  
RENDERING THE INFORMATION VOID, 25 UNLAWFUL AND WITHOUT EFFECT.

THIS NOTICE IS DONE ON BEHALF OF ALL 26 PEOPLE AND VOIDS ANY  
REQUIREMENT FOR THE ENTRY, INSPECTION OR TO 27 PRODUCE ANYTHING FOR  
ANY COURT, ATTORNEY OR LAW ENFORCEMENT.” ECF 28 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