

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

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

10
11 DAVID UPTON 1:07-cv-1047 LJO WMW (HC)
12 Petitioner,
13 vs. ORDER OF TRANSFER
14 THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
15 Respondent.

16 _____ /

17 Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed a habeas corpus action pursuant to 28
18 U.S.C. § 2254, together with a request to proceed in forma pauperis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

19 The federal venue statute requires that a civil action, other than one based on diversity
20 jurisdiction, be brought only in “(1) a judicial district where any defendant resides, if all defendants
21 reside in the same state, (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions
22 giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of the property that is the subject of the action is
23 situated, or (3) a judicial district in which any defendant may be found, if there is no district in which
24 the action may otherwise be brought.” 28 U.S.C. § 1331(b).

25 In this case, the petitioner is challenging a conviction from San Bernardino County, which is in
26 the Central District of California. Therefore, the petition should have been filed in the United States
27 District Court for the Central District of California. In the interest of justice, a federal court may transfer
28 a case filed in the wrong district to the correct district. See 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a); Starnes v. McGuire,

1 512 F.2d 918, 932 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

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

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 **Dated: July 25, 2007**

6 /s/ **William M. Wunderlich**
7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28