

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 CLAUDE DIXON,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 CHRISTOPHER DIXON, et al.,

15 Defendants.
16

No. 2:14-cv-2982 MCE CKD PS

ORDER

17 Plaintiff is proceeding in this action pro se. Plaintiff alleges diversity as the basis for
18 subject matter jurisdiction. The federal venue statute provides that a civil action may be brought
19 only in “(1) a judicial district where any defendant resides, if all defendants are residents of the
20 State in which the district is located; (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events
21 or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of property that is the subject
22 of the action is situated; or (3) if there is no district in which an action may otherwise be brought
23 as provided in this section, any judicial district in which any defendant is subject to the court’s
24 personal jurisdiction with respect to such action.” 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).

25 The property which is the subject of this action is located in Azle, Texas, which is located
26 in Tarrant County. Defendants also reside in Azle, Texas. Therefore, plaintiff’s claim should
27 have been filed in the United States District Court, Northern District of Texas. In the interest of
28 justice, a federal court may transfer a complaint filed in the wrong district to the correct district.

1 See 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a); Starnes v. McGuire, 512 F.2d 918, 932 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

2 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this matter is transferred to the United
3 States District, Northern District of Texas.

4 Dated: January 8, 2015



CAROLYN K. DELANEY
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

7 4 dixon.tra