(HC) Bayramoglu v	v. Hartley	Ι	Doc. 18
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
7	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
8			
9	FIKRI BAYRAMOGLU,	1:08-cv-01517 LJO YNP [DLB] (HC)	
10	Petitioner,	ORDER TRANSFERRING CASE TO THE	
11	VS.	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF	
12	J.D. HARTLEY, Warden	CALIFORNIA	
13	Respondent.		
14	/		
15			
16	Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed a habeas corpus action pursuant to 28		
17	U.S.C. § 2254.		
18	Venue for a habeas action is proper in either the district of confinement or the district of		
19	conviction. 28 U.S.C. A. § 2241 (d). However, it is preferable for petitions challenging a conviction		
20	or sentence to be heard in the district of conviction while petitions challenging the manner in which the		
21	sentence is being executed be heard in the district of confinement. Dunne v. Henman, 875 F.2d 244, 249		
22	(9th Cir. 1989).		
23	In this case Petitioner was convicted in Marin County in the Northern District of California and		and
24	is confined at Chuckawalla Valley State Prison in the Southern District of California. Petitioner		
25	complains that he was not given access to the Turkish Embassy at the time of trial and that he was		
26	denied a fair trial due to jury misconduct. (Pet. at 8). Petitioner is challenging his conviction from the		
27	Marin County Superior Court; therefore, the petition should have been filed in the United States District		
28	Court for the Northern District of California. In the interest of justice, a federal court may transfer a case		
		•	

filed in the wrong district to the correct district. See 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a); Starnes v. McGuire, 512 F.2d 918, 932 (D.C. Cir. 1974). Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this matter is transferred to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: September 25, 2009 /s/ Dennis L. Beck
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE