(PC) Robinson v. N	Martel et al	Do
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11		
12	DANIEL ROBINSON,	1:10-cv-01205 (PC)
13	Plaintiff,	ORDER TRANSFERRING CASE TO THE
14	VS.	SACRAMENTO DIVISION OF THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
15	M. MARTEL, et al.,	
16	Defendants.	
17		_/
18	Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed a civil rights action pursuant to 42	
19	U.S.C. § 1983, together with a request to proceed in forma pauperis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915.	
20	In his complaint, plaintiff alleges violations of his civil rights by defendants. The alleged	
21	violations took place in Amador County, which is part of the Sacramento Division of the United	
22	States District Court for the Eastern District of California. Therefore, the complaint should have	
23	been filed in the Sacramento Division.	
24	Pursuant to Local Rule 120(b), a civil action which has not been commenced in the proper	
25	court may, on the court's own motion, be transferred to the proper court. Therefore, this action will	
26	be transferred to the Sacramento Division. This court will not rule on plaintiff's request to proceed in	
27	forma pauperis.	
28	Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:	
		-1-
		•

Doc. 3

1	1. This action is transferred to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of
2	California sitting in Sacramento; and
3	2. All future filings shall refer to the new Sacramento case number assigned and shall be
4	filed at:
5	H.'. 10 D' C
6 7	United States District Court Eastern District of California 501 "I" Street, Suite 4-200 Sacramento, CA 95814
8	3. This court has not ruled on plaintiff's request to proceed in forma pauperis.
9	IT IS SO ORDERED.
10	Dated: July 8, 2010 /s/ Sheila K. Oberto UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
11	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	