

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

HECTOR AYALA,	1:17-cv-00803-MJS (HC)
Petitioner,	
v.	ORDER TRANSFERRING CASE TO THE
BRANDON PRICE,	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
Respondent.	THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
	CALIFORNIA

Petitioner is a civil detainee proceeding pro se with a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

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).

Venue for a habeas action is proper in either the district of confinement or the district of conviction. 28 U.S.C. § 2241(d). The district court for the district wherein such an application is filed may, in the exercise of its discretion and in furtherance of justice,

1 transfer the application to the other district court for hearing and determination. Id.

2 It is preferable for petitions challenging a conviction or sentence to be heard in the
3 district of conviction and for petitions challenging the manner in which the sentence is
4 being executed to be heard in the district of confinement. Dunne v. Henman, 875 F.2d
5 244, 249 (9th Cir. 1989). In this case, it appears that Petitioner is challenging a
6 conviction from San Bernardino County, which is in the Central District of California. See
7 28 U.S.C. § 84. Therefore, the petition should have been filed in the United States
8 District Court for the Central District of California. In the interest of justice, the petition will
9 be transferred to the United States District Court for the Central District of California. 28
10 U.S.C. §§ 1404(a) and 2241(d).

11 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this matter is transferred to the
12 United States District Court for the Central District of California.

13
14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 Dated: June 20, 2017

16 /s/ Michael J. Seng
17 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28