

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DONALD B. WILLIAMS,
Plaintiff,
v.
D. NETTLETON, et al.,
Defendant.

Case No. 1:14-cv-01630 BAM (PC)

ORDER TRANSFERRING CASE TO THE
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

The federal venue statute requires that a civil action, other than one based on diversity jurisdiction, be brought only in “(1) a judicial district in which any defendant resides, if all defendants are residents of the State in which the district is located; (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of property that is the subject of the action is situated; or (3) if there is no district in which an action may otherwise be brought as provided in this section, any judicial district in which any defendant is subject to the court’s personal jurisdiction with respect to such action.” 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).

In this case, none of the defendants reside in this district. The claim arose in San Luis Obispo County, which is in the Central District of California. Therefore, plaintiff’s claim should

1 have been filed in the United States District Court for the Central District of California. In the
2 interest of justice, a federal court may transfer a complaint filed in the wrong district to the
3 correct district. See 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a); Starnes v. McGuire, 512 F.2d 918, 932 (D.C. Cir.
4 1974).

5 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this matter is transferred to the United
6 States District Court for the Central District of California.

7
8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 Dated: October 21, 2014

/s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28