

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROBERT AMATRONE, et al.,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
RANDY CHAMPION, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 2:15-cv-0616 KJM CKD PS

## ORDER

RANDY CHAMPION, et al.,  
Defendants

Plaintiffs are proceeding in this action pro se. Plaintiffs do not allege a basis for subject matter jurisdiction. The federal venue statute provides that a civil action may be brought only in “(1) a judicial district where any defendant resides, if all defendants are residents of the State in which the district is located; (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of property that is the subject of the action is situated; or (3) if there is no district in which an action may otherwise be brought as provided in this section, any judicial district in which any defendant is subject to the court’s personal jurisdiction with respect to such action.” 28 U.S.C. § 13391(b).

In this action, plaintiffs allege that defendants unlawfully searched their residence located in Alamo, California, which is in Contra Costa County. Plaintiffs also allege claims against various Contra Costa officials. Therefore, plaintiff's claim should have been filed in the United States District Court, Northern District of California. In the interest of justice, a federal court

1 may transfer a complaint filed in the wrong district to the correct district. See 28 U.S.C.  
2 § 1406(a); Starnes v. McGuire, 512 F.2d 918, 932 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this matter is transferred to the United  
4 States District Court, Northern District of California, Oakland Division.

5 Dated: March 23, 2015

*Carolyn K. Delaney*

6 CAROLYN K. DELANEY  
7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

8

9 4 amatrome.tra

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28