

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

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

JOSE E. FALU-MENDOZA,

1:11-cv-01003 SKO (HC)

Petitioner,

ORDER TRANSFERRING CASE TO THE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

vs.

JAMES D. HARTLEY, Warden,

Respondent.

_____ /

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

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).

In this case, the petitioner is challenging a conviction from Los Angeles County, which is in the

1 Central District of California. Therefore, the petition should have been filed in the United States District
2 Court for the Central District of California. In the interest of justice, a federal court may transfer a case
3 filed in the wrong district to the correct district. See 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a); Starnes v. McGuire, 512 F.2d
4 918, 932 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

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

7 **Dated: June 21, 2011**

/s/ Sheila K. Oberto
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