I

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11		
12	DAVID HAMILTON,	1:13-cv-00838 GSA (PC)
13	Plaintiff,	ORDER TRANSFERRING CASE TO THE SACRAMENTO DIVISION OF THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
14	VS.	
15	MULE CREEK STATE PRISON, 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(f), 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	///	

1	Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:	
2	1. This action is transferred to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of	
3	California sitting in Sacramento; and	
4	2. All future filings shall refer to the new Sacramento case number assigned and shall be	
5	filed at:	
6	United States District Court	
7		
8	Sacramento, CA 95814	
9	3. This court has not ruled on plaintiff's request to proceed in forma pauperis.	
10	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
11	Dated:June 6, 2013/s/ Gary S. AustinUNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		