

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
DISTRICT OF MAINE

In re:

KEVIN J. MATTSON,

Debtor.

Chapter 7
Case No. 24-20188

**ORDER DENYING DEBTOR'S CONSOLIDATED
MOTION TO QUASH SUBPOENAS**

Kevin J. Mattson, the debtor in the above-captioned case, seeks an order quashing, or in the alternative, modifying subpoenas Montresor, LLC issued to Gardiner Federal Credit Union, Kennebec Savings, and Winthrop Federal Credit Union on or about April 2, 2026 in connection with a pending contested matter. Mr. Mattson contends that the requests for information contained in the subpoenas are unduly burdensome because they are duplicative of requests Montresor, LLC made in connection with an earlier proceeding. Though Mr. Mattson does not reference the rule, the Court presumes he is moving under Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(d)(3)(A)(iv), as made applicable to this proceeding by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 7045.

Courts have long held that non-recipients lack standing under Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(d)(3) to challenge a subpoena on the basis of undue burden. *See, Silverstone Holding Grp., LLC v. Zhongtie Dacheng (Zhuhai) Inv. Mgmt. Co., Ltd.*, 605 F.Supp.3d 199, 202-03 (S.D.N.Y. 2023) (“[b]ecause Silverstone is not the recipient of the subpoena, it does not have standing to challenge the subpoena on the independent grounds of undue burden or relevance.”). *See also, Renaissance Custom Homes, LLC v. Elite Homes, LLC*, 2024 WL 6078711, at *1 (D. Ore. Oct. 9, 2024); (*Wyatt B. v. Kotek*, 2024 WL 1905563, at *2 (D. Ore. May 1, 2024); *Torres v. Equifax Info. Services*, 2023 WL 12073732, at *1 (M.D. Pa. Aug. 29, 2023); *Gabriel v. Albany Coll. of*

Pharmacy and Health Sciences – Vermont Campus, 2014 WL 3378629, at *3 (D.Vt. July 10, 2014).

As Mr. Mattson is not the recipient of the subpoenas, he has no standing to move for quashal and, therefore, the motions is DENIED.

Dated: April 16, 2026

/s/ Peter G. Cary
Judge Peter G. Cary
United States Bankruptcy Court