UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
TONY BLACKMAN,	Case No.: 1:17-cv-01627 BAM (PC)
Plaintiff,	ORDER TRANSFERRING ACTION TO THE
v.	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
R. DIZON, et al.,	
Defendants.	
Plaintiff Tony Blackman, a state prisoner proceeding <i>pro se</i> , has filed a civil rights action	
8 pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On December 6, 2017, Plaintiff filed a complaint, (ECF No. 1) and	
an application to proceed <i>in forma pauperis</i> pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, (ECF No. 2).	
Plaintiff sues prison officials employed at the Richard J. Donovan Correctional Facility in	
San Diego, California. Plaintiff appears to allege that he was a victim of a hate crime and other	
violations occurred against his rights while he was housed at that institution.	
The federal venue statute requires that a civil action, other than one based on diversity	
jurisdiction, be brought only in "(1) a judicial district where any defendant resides, if all	
defendants reside in the same state, (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 the property that is the	
subject of the action is situated, or (3) a judicial district in which any defendant may be found, if	
there is no district in which the action may of	herwise be brought." 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).
	EASTERN DIST TONY BLACKMAN, Plaintiff, v. R. DIZON, et al., Defendants. Plaintiff Tony Blackman, a state priso pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On December an application to proceed <i>in forma pauperis</i> p Plaintiff sues prison officials employe San Diego, California. Plaintiff appears to all violations occurred against his rights while he The federal venue statute requires that jurisdiction, be brought only in "(1) a judicial defendants reside in the same state, (2) a judic or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred subject of the action is situated, or (3) a judic

1	In this case, none of the defendants reside in this district. The claim arose in San Diego	
2	County, which is in the Southern District of California. Therefore, Plaintiff's claim should have	
3	been filed in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California.	
4	In the interest of justice, a federal court may transfer a complaint filed in the wrong	
5	district to the correct district. See 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a); Starnes v. McGuire, 512 F.2d 918, 932	
6	(D.C. Cir. 1974).	
7	For the foregoing reasons, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this matter is transferred to the	
8	United States District Court for the Southern District of California. The Court makes no ruling on	
9	Plaintiff's pending application to proceed in forma paueris.	
10		
11	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
12	Dated: December 8, 2017 /s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe	
13	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	2	