

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DAVID ANTHONY CARDONA,

Petitioner,

No. CIV S-11-0020 DAD P

vs.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

Respondent.

ORDER

_____ /

Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed an application for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

Petitioner is presently incarcerated at Chino State Prison in Chino, California. He is serving a sentence pursuant to a judgment of conviction entered by the Los Angeles County Superior Court.

The general rule with regard to habeas applications is that both the United States District Court in the district where petitioner was convicted and the District Court where petitioner is incarcerated have jurisdiction over the claims. See Braden v. 30th Judicial Circuit Court, 410 U.S. 484 (1973). In the instant case, both the court in which petitioner was convicted and his place of incarceration are located within the boundaries of the District Court for the Central District of California. Accordingly, in the furtherance of justice, IT IS HEREBY

1 ORDERED that this matter is transferred to the United States District Court for the Central
2 District of California. Id. at 499 n.15; 28 U.S.C. § 2241(d).

3 DATED: January 12, 2011.

4
5 
6 _____
7 DALE A. DROZD
8 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

8 DAD:md/4
9 card0020.108a

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26