

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
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

FREDERICK WILSON, JR,
Petitioner,
v.
WILLIAM L. MUNIZ,
Respondent.

1:16-cv-0616 JLT (HC)
ORDER TRANSFERRING CASE TO THE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Frederick Wilson, Jr. filed a habeas corpus action and a request to proceed in forma pauperis in this Court. However, he seeks to challenge a conviction arising from the Central District of California. Thus, the Court must transfer the matter to that District.

I. Analysis

The federal venue statute requires that a civil action, other than one based on diversity jurisdiction, be brought only in “(1) a judicial district where any defendant resides, if all defendants reside in the same state, (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of the property that is the subject of the action is situated, or (3) a judicial district in which any defendant may be found, if there is no district in which the action may otherwise be brought.” 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).

As noted above, the petitioner is challenging a conviction from Los Angeles County, which is in the Central District of California. Therefore, the petition should have been filed in the

1 United States District Court for the Central District of California. In the interest of justice, a
2 federal court may transfer a case filed in the wrong district to the correct district. See 28 U.S.C. §
3 1406(a); Starnes v. McGuire, 512 F.2d 918, 932 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

4 Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** this matter to be transferred to the United States
5 District Court for the Central District of California.

6
7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: May 9, 2016

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28