(HC) Kutylo v. Dickinson		
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	STEPHEN E. KUTYLO,	) 1:11-cv-01982 JLT (HC)
12	Petitioner,	ORDER TRANSFERRING CASE TO THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
13	vs.	) THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
14	KATHLEEN L. DICKINSON, Warden	
15	Respondent.	
16		)
17		
18	Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed a habeas corpus action pursuant to 28	
19	U.S.C. § 2254, together with a request to proceed in forma pauperis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915.	
20	The federal venue statute requires that a civil action, other than one based on diversity	
21	jurisdiction, be brought only in "(1) a judicial district where any defendant resides, if all defendants	
22	reside in the same state, (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions	
23	giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of the property that is the subject of the action is	
24	situated, or (3) a judicial district in which any defendant may be found, if there is no district in which	
25	the action may otherwise be brought." 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).	
26	In this case, the petitioner is challenging a conviction from Riverside County, which is in the	
27	Central District of California. Therefore, the petition should have been filed in the United States District	
28	Court for the Central District of California. In the interest of justice, a federal court may transfer a case	
	-1-	

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 Central District of California. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: December 2, 2011 /s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE