(PC) Hampton v. V	Valker et al	Doc	3. 3
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	IN	THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11			
12	JAMES HAMPTON,	1:13-cv-01456 SAB (PC)	
13	Plaintif		
14	vs.	SACRAMENTO DIVISION OF THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
15	W. WALKER, et al.,		
16	Defendants.		
17	/		
18	Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed a civil rights action pursuant to 42		
19	U.S.C. § 1983, together with a request to proceed in forma pauperis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915.		
20	In his complaint, plaintiff alleges violations of his civil rights by defendants. The alleged		
21	violations took place in Solano County, which is part of the Sacramento Division of the United		
22	States District Court for the Eastern District of California. Therefore, the complaint should have		
23	been filed in the Sacramento Division.		
24	Pursuant to Local Rule 120(f), a civil action which has not been commenced in the proper		
25	court may, on the court's own motion, be transferred to the proper court. Therefore, this action will		
26	be transferred to the Sacramento Division. This court will not rule on plaintiff's request to proceed in		
27	forma pauperis.		
28	Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:		
		-1-	
		-1-	
		Dockets Justia c	J <sub>m</sub>

1	1. This action is transferred to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of			
2	California sitting in Sacramento; and			
3	2. All future filings shall refer to the new Sacramento case number assigned and shall be			
4	filed at:			
5				
6	United States District Court Eastern District of California			
7	501 "I" Street, Suite 4-200 Sacramento, CA 95814			
8	3. This court has not ruled on plaintiff's request to proceed in forma pauperis.			
9				
10	IT IS SO ORDERED.			
11	Dated: September 17, 2013			
12	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE			
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				