

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

STEVEN WAYNE BONILLA,

Petitioner,

v.

ALAMEDA COUNTY,

Respondent.

Case No. 1:19-cv-01121-SAB-HC

ORDER TRANSFERRING CASE TO THE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

When a state prisoner files a habeas petition in a state that contains two or more federal judicial districts, the petition may be filed in either the judicial district in which the petitioner is presently confined or the judicial district in which he was convicted and sentenced. See 28 U.S.C. § 2241(d); Rumsfeld v. Padilla, 542 U.S. 426, 442 (2004) (quoting Carbo v. United States, 364 U.S. 611, 618 (1961)). Petitions challenging the execution of a sentence are preferably heard in the district where the inmate is confined. See Dunne v. Henman, 875 F.2d 244, 249 (9th Cir. 1989). Petitions challenging convictions or sentences are preferably heard in the district of conviction. See Laue v. Nelson, 279 F. Supp. 265, 266 (N.D. Cal. 1968). Section 2241 further states that, rather than dismissing an improperly filed action, a district court, “in the exercise of its discretion and in furtherance of justice may transfer” the habeas petition to another

1 federal district for hearing and determination. 28 U.S.C. § 2241(d); see also 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a)
2 (court may transfer any civil action “to any other district or division where it might have been
3 brought” for convenience of parties or “in the interest of justice”).

4 Here, Petitioner is currently housed at the San Quentin State Prison in Marin County,
5 which is part of the Northern District of California. Petitioner also appears to challenge a
6 criminal judgment from the Alameda County Superior Court. Therefore, venue is proper in the
7 district of conviction, which is the Northern District of California.

8 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this action is transferred to the United
9 States District Court for the Northern District of California.

10
11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12 Dated: August 20, 2019


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

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