(PC) Brooks	v. Tate		
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10	RODNEY BROOKS,		
11	Plaintiff,	No. CIV S-11-2285 DAD P	
12	VS.		
13	HAROLD TATE,		
14	Defendant.	<u>ORDER</u>	
15			
16	Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed a civil rights action pursuant		
17	to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, together with a request to proceed in forma pauperis. In his complaint,		
18	plaintiff alleges violations of his civil rights by defendants. The alleged violations took place at		
19	California State Prison - Tehachapi in Kern County, which is part of the Fresno Division of the		
20	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California. See Local Rule 120(d).		
21	Pursuant to Local Rule 120(f), a civil action which has not been commenced in		
22	the proper division of a court may, on the court's own motion, be transferred to the proper		
23	division of the court. Therefore, this action will be transferred to the Fresno Division of the		
24	court. In light of 1996 amendments to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, this court will not rule on plaintiff's		
25	request to proceed in forma pauperis.		
26	/////		
		1	

Doc. 4

1	Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:	
2	1. This court has not ruled on plaintiff's request to proceed in forma pauperis;	
3	2. This action is transferred to the United States District Court for the Eastern	
4	District of California sitting in Fresno; and	
5	3. All future filings shall reference the new Fresno case number assigned and	
6	shall be filed at:	
7	Eastern District of California	
8		
9		
10	DATED: September 6, 2011.	
11	Dale A. Dage	
12	DALE A. DROZD	
13	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
14		
15	DAD:mp broo2285.22	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		