



1 **I. BACKGROUND**

2 In May 2016, Stericycle served a subpoena on Patriot pursuant to Rule 45.<sup>1</sup> *See, e.g.*, Docket  
3 No. 2, Exhibit 1. Stericycle served the subpoena in connection with a lawsuit that Stericycle had  
4 filed in the Northern District of Illinois. *See, e.g.*, Docket No 2 at 5.<sup>2</sup> The subpoena requires that  
5 Patriot comply with it in the Northern District of Illinois. Docket No. 2, Exhibit 1. Patriot is not a  
6 defendant in the Illinois case, but rather possesses documents, tangible items, and information that  
7 Stericycle initially attempted to obtain from the defendants in that case. Docket No. 2 at 10-11.  
8 Stericycle alleges that Patriot refused to comply with the subpoena. *Id.* at 11-12. As a result,  
9 Stericycle filed a motion to compel Patriot’s compliance with the subpoena in the Central District  
10 of California, where Patriot is headquartered. *Id.* at 12. Stericycle later voluntarily suspended its  
11 efforts to seek enforcement of the subpoena in the Central District of California. *Id.* at 14.  
12 Stericycle then filed the Motion to Compel and Motion to Transfer at issue here. *See* Docket No.  
13 2 at 11-14.

14 **II. MAGISTRATE JUDGE AUTHORITY**

15 The pending motions have been referred to the undersigned magistrate judge. Before turning  
16 to the merits of the pending motions, the Court evaluates its authority to decide them. The authority  
17 of the undersigned magistrate judge is derived from 28 U.S.C. § 636, which generally provides  
18 magistrate judges with the authority to “hear and determine” non-dispositive matters. *See* 28 U.S.C.  
19 § 636(b)(1)(A); *see also S.E.C. v. CMKM Diamonds, Inc.*, 729 F.3d 1248, 1259 (9th Cir. 2013). By  
20 contrast, dispositive matters are sometimes referred to magistrate judges, but in those circumstances  
21 a magistrate judge submits a recommendation to the assigned district judge that is subject to the  
22 district judge’s *de novo* review. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B); *see also CMKM Diamonds*, 729 F.3d  
23 at 1259-60.

---

24  
25 <sup>1</sup>Unless otherwise noted, references to “Rules” refer to the Federal Rules of Civil  
26 Procedure.

27 <sup>2</sup>Given the manner in which the briefs were filed on the docket, at times the pagination  
28 assigned by the parties differs by the pagination assigned by the CM/ECF system. The Court's  
citations refer to the pagination assigned by the CM/ECF system.

1           The pending dispute falls within the gambit of non-dispositive matters properly determined  
2 by a magistrate judge. Magistrate judges are frequently tasked with resolving discovery disputes.  
3 *See, e.g., Columbia Pictures, Inc. v. Bunnell*, 245 F.R.D. 443, 448 (C.D. Cal. 2007). More  
4 particularly, ruling on a request to transfer subpoena-related motions to another court is within the  
5 provision of a magistrate judge’s authority under Section 636(b)(1)(A). *See Chem-Aqua, Inc. v.*  
6 *Nalco Co.*, 2014 WL 2645999, \*1 (N.D. Tex. June 13, 2014); *see also Pavao v. Unifund CCR*  
7 *Partners*, 934 F. Supp. 2d 1238, 1241 n.1 (S.D. Cal. 2013) (collecting cases for transfers under 28  
8 U.S.C. § 1404(a)). That subpoena-related motions come before the court in the context of a  
9 miscellaneous action based entirely on the disputed subpoenas does not alter that conclusion, even  
10 though the magistrate judge’s resolution of the motions may be dispositive of the miscellaneous  
11 action. *Feist v. RCN Corp.*, 2012 WL 4835038, \*1 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 4, 2012). Accordingly, the  
12 undersigned has the authority to resolve the subpoena-related dispute currently pending before the  
13 Court.

## 14   **II.    THE MOTIONS**

15           Stericycle’s Motion to Compel describes its discovery dispute with Patriot at length and  
16 argues that the Court should compel Patriot to comply with the subpoena. *See generally* Docket No.  
17 2. The Motion to Compel fails to address this Court’s jurisdiction to resolve a motion related to a  
18 subpoena that requires compliance in Illinois. *See generally* Docket No. 2. Stericycle’s subsequent  
19 Motion to Transfer slightly changes course, arguing that this Court should transfer its Motion to  
20 Compel to the Northern District of Illinois. *See, e.g.,* Docket No. 2 at 6.


21           Patriot responds that this Court is not the court where compliance with the subpoena is  
22 required, as the subpoena requires compliance in the Northern District of Illinois. Docket No. 23  
23 at 14. Therefore, Patriot argues, this Court does not have jurisdiction under Rule 45(d) to enforce  
24 Plaintiff’s Motion to Compel. *Id.* Patriot presents no argument as to why this Court should *not*  
25 transfer Stericycle’s Motion to Compel to the Northern District of Illinois. *See generally* Docket No.  
26 23. Indeed, Patriot appears to assert that the Northern District of Illinois is the correct forum in  
27 which to resolve the Motion to Compel. *See id.* at 14-16.

28           Stericycle replies that this Court should grant its Motion to Transfer. Docket No. 32 at 5.

1 Specifically, Stericycle argues that the Northern District of Illinois will have the jurisdiction to  
2 modify the subpoena as necessary, and to enforce it. *Id.*

3 In essence, both parties agree that the Northern District of Illinois is the appropriate forum  
4 in which to resolve Stericycle's Motion to Compel. Additionally, this Court does not have  
5 jurisdiction to resolve Stericycle's Motion to Compel because the District of Nevada is not "the court  
6 for the district where compliance is required." *See* Rule 45(d); *see also Agincourt Gaming, LLC v.*  
7 *Zynga, Inc.*, 2014 WL 4079555, at \*4-5 (D. Nev. Aug. 15, 2014) (finding no jurisdiction under Rule  
8 45 to resolve subpoena-related motions and relying on 28 U.S.C. § 1631 to transfer those motions  
9 to the court in the district where compliance was required).

10 Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS** Stericycle's Motion to Transfer. Docket No. 6. The  
11 Court **ORDERS** that Stericycle's Motion to Compel, Docket No. 2, be transferred to the Northern  
12 District of Illinois. The Court further **INSTRUCTS** the Clerk's Office to administratively close this  
13 action.



14  
15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

\_\_\_\_\_  
NANCY J. KOPPE  
United States Magistrate Judge

16 Dated: August 25, 2016

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28