

**FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

In the Matter of:

DANIELLE “SHANTA” SOLOMON,
an institution-affiliated party of

Truist Bank
Charlotte, North Carolina

(Insured State Nonmember Bank)

Docket No.:
FDIC-24-0100e
FDIC-24-0101b

ORDER NO. 12: DENYING MOTION TO QUASH THIRD-PARTY SUBPOENA

On December 16, 2024, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (“FDIC”) issued a Notice of Charges (“NOC”) against Respondent Danielle “Shanta” Solomon, a personal banker with Truist Bank (“Truist”) and an institution-affiliated party (“IAP”), alleging, among others, that Solomon made unauthorized transfers from the accounts of two elderly bank customers to accounts at other financial institutions held in the name of her husband, Jesse Solomon. NOC at 3, 4, and 6-7. On July 10, 2025, Enforcement Counsel for the FDIC (“EC”) submitted unopposed applications for third-party subpoenas for financial information from accounts held by Jesse Solomon at Citibank, E*TRADE, Merrill Lynch, and Webull Financial (“Webull”). EC, in its unopposed application for the third-party subpoenas, stated that it sought “documents evidencing transfers alleged in the [NOC], how funds were used, and account ownership and authorization.” Unopposed Application for Third Party Subpoenas, dated July 10, 2025 (“Application”) at 2. On August 13, 2025, the OFIA received a motion from Jesse Solomon, unrepresented by counsel (*pro se*) and a non-party to these proceedings, to quash the subpoenas to Citibank, E*TRADE, Merrill Lynch, and Webull (“Motion”).¹ For the reasons discussed herein, the Motion is DENIED.

¹ The Motion was sent on August 1, 2025 via First Class mail to an incorrect address at the FDIC, which was received on August 7, 2025, and, due to processing delays, was not received by the Office of Financial Institution Adjudication (“OFIA”) until August 13, 2025. In the future, all filings with OFIA in connection with this action should be

I. BACKGROUND

On June 2, 2025, Danielle Solomon and EC (together, “the Parties”) agreed to temporarily stay proceedings to discuss settlement. Order No. 6 at 1. The Parties requested limited discovery to facilitate negotiations. *Id.* On June 25, 2025, the administrative law judge (“ALJ”) issued a joint discovery plan and a protective order. Orders 9 and 10. On July 10, 2025, EC submitted unopposed applications for third-party subpoenas for certain financial information which the ALJ duly granted. Subsequently, Jesse Solomon filed the instant Motion.

II. JESSE SOLOMON’S FINANCIAL RECORDS ARE MATERIALLY RELEVANT TO THE MERITS OF THE ENFORCEMENT ACTION

The Uniform Rules of Practice and Procedure that govern these proceedings provide that “[a] party may obtain document discovery regarding any non-privileged matter that has material relevance to the merits of the pending action.” 12 C.F.R. § 308.24(b) (2025). Parties may request subpoenas for documents directed at non-parties, but the application must include “a brief statement showing the general relevance and reasonableness of the scope of the documents sought.” *Id.* at § 308.26(a)(1) (2025). In the instant case, Jesse Solomon argues that “[he] has no connection to the underlying enforcement action beyond a single, unrelated business transaction.” Motion at 1. Solomon elaborates that he was never employed by Truist, and that he and his wife, Danielle Solomon, maintain separate financial accounts. In other words, according to Solomon, the financial documents sought by EC have no material relevance to the underlying action. Solomon further asserts that “[t]he FDIC already possesses documentation confirming that all funds to this transaction were returned.” Motion at 1-2, and 4.² In its opposition to the Motion

submitted via email at ofia@fdic.gov in accordance with Section 1.1 of this ALJ’s procedural ground rules. Order No. 8: Ground Rules at 1.

² Jesse Solomon repeatedly claims that “[t]he subpoenas contain incorrect identifying information that does not accurately correspond to [his] legal records,” Motion at 2. He does not, however, identify what information is purportedly incorrect.

(“Response”), EC contends that “the information sought in the [requested] subpoenas was relevant and reasonable” because “[e]ach of the allegations of misappropriated funds includes a transfer to [Jesse] Solomon.” Response at 1-2. The ALJ agrees.

The NOC alleges that Danielle Solomon made unauthorized transfers from the accounts of two elderly Truist customers to accounts held in the name of her husband, Jesse Solomon. NOC at 2-7. Danielle Solomon is alleged, among others, to have initiated transactions from the accounts of Truist customers J.H. and J.L. to pay Jesse Solomon’s credit card balances at Citibank, *Id.* at 3, 7, initiated a wire transfer from the account of J.H. to a “bidding account for back tax properties in the name of Jesse Solomon in Polk County, Florida,” *Id.* at 4, and initiated a wire transfer from the account of customer J.L. to an E*TRADE account in the name of Jesse Solomon. *Id.* at 6-7.

Among the subpoenas sought and issued were ones to Citibank and E*TRADE related to the accounts belonging to Jesse Solomon, allegedly the recipient of transfers from the accounts of J.H. and J.L. Application at 3. EC stated that the subpoenas were necessary “to document both sides of the transactions and to determine how the funds were used by [Danielle Solomon] and her husband.” *Id.* EC also sought and received subpoenas directed at Merrill Lynch and Webull because Danielle Solomon claimed that her husband had partially repaid J.H. from or to those accounts. *Id.* at 3-4. EC asserted that those records were necessary “to validate the alleged repayment” and “to determine the full extent of funds transferred between accounts of J.H., [Danielle Solomon], and Jesse Solomon.” *Id.* Accordingly, the ALJ finds that the financial documents sought by the subpoenas are materially relevant to the pending action and the scope is relevant and reasonable. 12 C.F.R. §§ 308.24(b), 308.26(a)(1) (2025).

III. CONCLUSION

Because the financial information related to Jesse Solomon sought by EC in its subpoenas to Citibank, E*TRADE, Merrill Lynch and Webull is directly and materially relevant to the FDIC's allegations against Danielle Solomon, as set forth in the NOC and detailed in EC's subpoena application, the Motion is DENIED.

SO ORDERED.

Issued: August 29, 2025



C. Scott Maravilla
Administrative Law Judge
Office of Financial Institution Adjudication

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

On August 29, 2025, I served a copy of the foregoing **Order** upon the following individuals via email:

Administrative Officer
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation
550 17th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20429
ESSenforcementactiondocket@fdic.gov

Enforcement Counsel:
Seth Rosebrock, Assistant General Counsel
(srosebrock@fdic.gov)
Katherine Walsh, Senior Attorney
(kawalsh@fdic.gov)
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation
550 17th Street NW
Washington, DC 20429


Respondent’s Counsel
Jack Meyerson
(jmeyerson@meyersonlawfirm.com)
Matthew Miller
(mmiller@meyersonlawfirm.com)
Meyerson & Miller
1600 Market Street, Suite 1305
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Patrice Walker, Regional Counsel
(pwalker@fdic.gov)
Benjamin Gibbs, Deputy Regional Counsel
(begibbs@fdic.gov)
Walter Siedentopf, Counsel
(wasiedentopf@fdic.gov)
Charlotte Bohn, Senior Attorney
(cbohn@fdic.gov)
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation
10 10th Street NE Suite 900
Atlanta, GA 30309

And to Mr. Solomon via first-class mail at:

Jesse Solomon
101 Allen Avenue
Winter Haven, FL 33884

Shirley Huang, Supervisory Counsel
(shhuang@fdic.gov)
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation
25 Jessie Street
San Francisco, CA 94105



C. Scott Maravilla
Office of Financial Institution Adjudication
3501 N. Fairfax Drive, Room D-8080
Arlington, VA 22226-3500