(PC) Harriso	n v. Cos, et al		
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	IN THE	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10	JAMES RUHALLAH HARRISON,		
11	Plaintiff,	No. 2:11-cv-2188 GEB DAD (PC)	
12		100. 2.11-cv-2100 GLD D1D (1 C)	
13	vs. D. TARNOFF, et al.,		
14	Defendants.	ORDER	
15	Defendants.	/	
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 in		
19	Kern County, which is part of the Fresno Division of the United States District Court for the		
20	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			
26	request to proceed in forma pauperis.		
20	11111	1	
Ш		_	

Doc. 7

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	United States District Court Eastern District of California	
8	2500 Tulare Street Fresno, CA 93721	
9		
10	DATED: September 8, 2011.	
11	2 2 .	
12	Dale A. Dryd DALE A. DROZD	
13	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
14		
15		
16	DAD:mp harr2188.22	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		