CIVIL DIVISION

Birch Vale Civil Tribunal

Civil Complaint

Robert Kim Plaintiff v. Alexandra Marshall Defendant	Case No. CV-76840 Civil Complaint: non-party subpoena-scope dispute

September 10, 2026

Civil complaint

1. Plaintiff Robert Kim files this Civil Complaint against Defendant Alexandra Marshall concerning the non-party production request.
2. Incident date: July 30, 2026; filing date: September 10, 2026.
3. Jurisdiction: the parties and the stated controversy fall within the tribunal jurisdiction identified in this caption.
4. Venue: the events concerning the non-party production request occurred in Birch Vale and the record is maintained there.
5. Claims: A non-party archive receives a subpoena for records described by a project name used in unrelated files. The archive asks for a date range and production location before searching its holdings.
6. Relief requested: an order directing the parties to preserve and compare the records concerning the non-party production request (including: subpoena, proof of service, custodian note, inventory); the procedural request is: The filing asks for project code, dates, categories, and production method, with a short response path for the non-party. It does not seek a contempt finding.
7. This complaint commences the civil action; it is not a judgment or finding on the merits.

Supporting record

Evidence ID: CV-76840, Dkt. 394; Exhibit B; exhibit: Exhibit B — the non-party production request record

Case trigger: A non-party archive receives a subpoena for records described by a project name used in unrelated files. The archive asks for a date range and production location before searching its holdings.

Case record: The record contains subpoena, proof of service, custodian note, and inventory showing three projects with similar names. The subpoena gives a general subject but no project code.

Issue and scope: The filing asks for project code, dates, categories, and production method, with a short response path for the non-party. It does not seek a contempt finding. It does not determine relevance, impose a sanction, or require every inventory record.

Evidentiary condition: The hearing bundle concerning the non-party production request contains selected examples rather than the complete sequence. The examples may illustrate an issue without showing how often it occurred.

Record control: The selecting party should describe the population, the selection method, and any excluded categories. The other party may identify a small number of additional entries needed to test whether the sample is representative.

Verification point: Neither side should characterize the sample as the whole record until its coverage and omissions have been addressed.

Response path: The parties can present a marked proposed order on the non-party production request while preserving the distinction between submission and direction entered.

Proposed handling: Provide the draft, identify operative paragraphs, serve it, and state agreed or disputed wording. Docket or signed order controls status.

Closure: Submission does not make terms effective or bind a party before entry.

Plaintiff filing

Joann Contreras, Attorney for filing party
Signature: _____ Date: _____