

**OFFICE OF STATE ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
STATE OF GEORGIA**

DAVID FARRAR,
LEAH LAX,
CODY JUDY,
THOMAS MALAREN,
LAURIE ROTH,

Plaintiffs,

v.

BARACK OBAMA,

Defendant.

:
:
:
: Docket Number: OSAH-SECSTATE-CE-
: 1215136-60-MALIHI

:
: Counsel for Plaintiffs: Orly Taitz

:
: Counsel for Defendant: Michael Jablonski

DAVID P. WELDEN,

Plaintiff,

v.

BARACK OBAMA,

Defendant.

:
:
:
: Docket Number: OSAH-SECSTATE-CE-
: 1215137-60-MALIHI

:
: Counsel for Plaintiff: Van R. Irion

:
: Counsel for Defendant: Michael Jablonski

CARL SWENSSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

BARACK OBAMA,

Defendant.

:
:
:
: Docket Number: OSAH-SECSTATE-CE-
: 1216218-60-MALIHI

:
: Counsel for Plaintiff: J. Mark Hatfield

:
: Counsel for Defendant: Michael Jablonski

KEVIN RICHARD POWELL,

Plaintiff,

v.

BARACK OBAMA,

Defendant.

:
:
:
: Docket Number: OSAH-SECSTATE-CE-
: 1216823-60-MALIHI

:
: Counsel for Plaintiff: J. Mark Hatfield

:
: Counsel for Defendant: Michael Jablonski

ORDER ON MOTION TO QUASH SUBPOENAS


Defendant, President Barack Obama, a candidate seeking the Democratic nomination for the office of the President of the United States, has filed a motion to quash the subpoena compelling his attendance at the hearing on January 26, 2012.

In support of his motion, Defendant argues that "if enforced, [the subpoena] requires him to interrupt duties as President of the United States" to attend a hearing in Atlanta, Georgia. However, Defendant fails to provide any legal authority to support his motion to quash the subpoena to attend. Defendant's motion suggests that no President should be compelled to attend a Court hearing. This may be correct. But Defendant has failed to enlighten the Court with any legal authority. Specifically, Defendant has failed to cite to any legal authority evidencing why his attendance is "unreasonable or oppressive, or that the testimony... [is] irrelevant, immaterial, or cumulative and unnecessary to a party's preparation or presentation at the hearing, or that basic fairness dictates that the subpoena should not be enforced." Ga. Comp. R. & Regs. r. 616-1-2-.19(5).

Defendant further alludes to a defect in service of the subpoena. However, the Court's rules provide for service of a subpoena upon a party, by serving the party's counsel of record. Ga. Comp. R. & Regs. r. 616-1-2-.19(4). Thus, the argument regarding service is without merit.

Accordingly, Defendant's motion to quash is denied.

SO ORDERED, this the 20th day of January, 2012.



MICHAEL M. MALIHI, Judge