(HC)Casner v. Dickinson		
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	KENNETH H. CASNER,	
11	Petitioner,	No. CIV S-10-1398 DAD P
12	vs.	
13	KATHLEEN DICKINSON, Warden,	
14	Respondent.	<u>ORDER</u>
15		
16	Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed an application for a writ of	
17	habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. In his application, petitioner challenges a judgment	
18	of conviction entered in the Tuolumne County Superior Court. Tuolumne County is part of the	
19	Fresno Division of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California. <u>See</u>	
20	Local Rule 120(d).	
21	Pursuant to Local Rule 120(f), a civil action which has not been commenced in	
22	the proper division of a court may, on the court's own motion, be transferred to the proper	
23	division of the court. Therefore, this action will be transferred to the Fresno Division of the	
24	court.	
25	/////	
26	/////	
		1

Doc. 3

Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 1. This action is transferred to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California sitting in Fresno; and 2. All future filings shall reference the new Fresno case number assigned and shall be filed at: **United States District Court** Eastern District of California 2500 Tulare Street Fresno, CA 93721 DATED: June 14, 2010. ale A. Dagel UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE DAD:mp:sj casn1398.109