

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

M. DEAN REED PRODUCTION
CORP and MARY DEAN REED,

Plaintiffs,

No. CIV S-06-2399 DFL DAD P

vs.

KERN COUNTY DEPT OF COURT,
et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

_____ /

On October 31, 2006, plaintiff Mary Dean Reed, a pretrial detainee confined in the Lerdo Women’s Pretrial Detention Center, filed a pro se complaint that has been construed by the Clerk of the Court as a civil rights complaint filed by a prisoner seeking relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On November 2, 2006, plaintiff filed an application to proceed in forma pauperis.¹

In her complaint, plaintiff lists numerous government entities, all located in Kern County or Los Angeles County, as defendants. Plaintiff alleges that Kern County and Los

¹ The certificate section of the form has not been completed by plaintiff’s institution of confinement, and no certified trust account statement has been provided by the institution. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

1 Angeles County engaged in a conspiracy against her.² Kern County is part of the Fresno Division
2 of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California. See Local Rule 3-
3 120(d). A civil action that has not been commenced in the proper division of this court may, on
4 the court's own motion, be transferred to the proper division of the court. See Local Rule 3-
5 120(f). This action will therefore be transferred to the Fresno Division of the court for further
6 proceedings.

7 Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

8 1. This action is transferred to the United States District Court for the Eastern
9 District of California sitting in Fresno; and

10 2. All future filings shall reference only the new Fresno case number to be
11 assigned to this case and shall be filed at:

12 United States District Court
13 Eastern District of California
14 2500 Tulare Street
15 Fresno, CA 93721

16 DATED: November 8, 2006.

17 
18 _____
19 DALE A. DROZD
20 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

21 DAD:13:bb
22 reed2399.22

23
24
25 _____
26 ² On October 30, 2006, plaintiff filed two actions against the same defendants: 2:06-cv-
2386 MCE GGH PS and 2:06-cv-2387 MCE DAD PS.