

**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

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
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 ~ Cttd0 Lhar—e_ 25 ALLISONCLAIRE.
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
27 28