

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
6 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
7

8 MARLON BLACHER,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 S. JOHNSON,

12 Defendant.

Case No. 1:12-cv-01159-EPG (PC)

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION  
FOR CHANGE OF VENUE AND PETITION  
FOR FULL DISCLOSURE  
(ECF NO. 100)

13 Marlon Blacher (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in  
14 this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On May 18, 2017, Plaintiff filed a motion  
15 for change of venue and petition for full disclosure (“the Motion”). (ECF No. 100). Plaintiff  
16 complains about how Magistrate Judge Stanley A. Boone handled the recent settlement  
17 conference in this case, and requests a change in venue to either the Northern District of  
18 California or the Sacramento Division of the Eastern District of California. Plaintiff also requests  
19 “full disclosure concerning the appointment and tenure” of Judge Boone.

20 The Court will deny the motion. As to Plaintiff’s request for a change of venue, Plaintiff  
21 has not satisfied the standards of 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a). 28 U.S.C. § 1404; 28 U.S.C. § 1391.  
22 Additionally, the Court will not exercise its discretion to transfer this case to the Sacramento  
23 Division. Plaintiff simply complains about Judge Boone, and alleges a general bias in the  
24 community against inmates. However, Judge Boone is not the not the presiding judge or the  
25 referral judge in this case. Judge Boone merely served as a settlement conference judge in an  
26 attempt to facilitate resolution of the case. Moreover, Plaintiff has not submitted any admissible  
27 evidence of the alleged bias. Not to mention that the alleged bias appears to concern Judge  
28 Boone’s legal opinions expressed confidentially during the settlement conference, rather than a

1 interest outside of the litigation that would render him unfairly partial to one side or the other.

2 As to Plaintiff's request for "full disclosure concerning the appointment and tenure" of  
3 Judge Boon, it will be denied. Plaintiff's request is vague and unfounded. Plaintiff already has  
4 information publicly available regarding Judge Boone. Again, Judge Boone is not the presiding  
5 or referral judge. Judge Boone generously agreed to conduct a settlement conference in order to  
6 facilitate a resolution of the case acceptable to all parties. Learning further information about his  
7 appointment is not relevant to any matter in this case, or to any judge presiding over the merits of  
8 the case.

9 Accordingly, based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Motion is  
10 DENIED.

11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12  
13 Dated: May 19, 2017

14 /s/ Eric P. Grig  
15 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28