

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA  
CHARLOTTE DIVISION  
CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:13-CV-011-RJC-DCK**

**LEE S. JOHNSON,** )  
 )  
 **Plaintiff,** )  
 )  
 **v.** )  
 )  
 **EXPERIAN INFORMATION** )  
 **SOLUTIONS, INC.,** )  
 )  
 **Defendant.** )  
 )

---

**ORDER**


**THIS MATTER IS BEFORE THE COURT** on “Defendant Experian Information Solutions, Inc.’s Motion To Quash Plaintiff’s Subpoena Duces Tecum” (Document No. 3) filed January 15, 2013. This motion has been referred to the undersigned Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), and immediate review is appropriate. Having carefully considered the motion, the record, and applicable authority, the undersigned will grant the motion.

*Pro se* Plaintiff Lee S. Johnson (“Plaintiff”) filed a “Complaint” (Document No. 1) initiating this action on January 8, 2013, and then served a “Subpoena To Produce Documents, Information, Or Objects Or To Permit Inspection Of Premises In A Civil Action” (Document No. 3-1) on Defendant Experian Information Solutions, Inc. (“Defendant”), on or about January 10, 2013. Plaintiff’s “Subpoena To Produce...” commanded Defendant to “Produce all credit report disputes, letters, date of phone calls from 01/01/05 – 12/31/12 . . . Produce credit disputes results from 01/01/05 – 12/31/12 . . . [and] Produce an audit on Lee S. Johnson ....” by January 15, 2013. (Document No. 3-1).

Defendant contends that the “Subpoena To Produce...” is improper and unduly burdensome, as well as premature. (Document No. 4) (citing Fed.R.Civ.P. 45(c)(3), 26(d), and 34). The undersigned agrees. In the interests of judicial economy, and noting that Plaintiff demanded production of certain documents and information by January 15, 2013, the undersigned finds that the pending “...Motion To Quash...” should be resolved without further delay.

**IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED** that “Defendant Experian Information Solutions, Inc.’s Motion To Quash Plaintiff’s Subpoena Duces Tecum” (Document No. 3) is **GRANTED**. Plaintiff may serve a subpoena at a later date, if necessary, consistent with the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Signed: January 16, 2013

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
David C. Keesler  
United States Magistrate Judge

