

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SEDGWICK CLAIMS MANAGEMENT SERVICES, INC.,

No. C 12-80106 WHA

Plaintiff,

v.

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR PROTECTION AND TO QUASH SUBPOENA**

KIMBERLEY SOUKUP,

Defendant.

Defendant Kimberley Soukup has filed a “motion for protection and objection to document subpoenas.” Specifically, defendant “requests that the Court GRANT Defendant’s Motion for Protection, QUASH Plaintiff’s document subpoena to Facebook, Inc., and grant such other and further relief to which she may be justly entitled” (Dkt. No. 1). Plaintiff Sedgwick Claims Management Services, Inc., opposes on the ground that this Court is not empowered to rule on the instant motion because the subpoena to Facebook, Inc., was issued by another court. Defendant has not replied.

The underlying action is proceeding in the Northern District of Texas. The subpoena that defendant seeks to quash, however, was issued by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California. According to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 45(c)(3), it is the

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

“issuing court” that has the power to quash or modify a subpoena. This Court was not the issuing court and will not quash or modify a subpoena issued by another court. The motion is, therefore, **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**



Dated: June 18, 2012.

---

WILLIAM ALSUP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE