1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	OMAR SHARRIEFF GAY,	No. 2:16-cv-2533 GEB CKD P
12	Plaintiff,	
13	V.	<u>ORDER</u>
14	JENNIFER SHAFFER, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed an action for violation of civil rights	
18	under 42 U.S.C. §983. Plaintiff originally filed this action in the United States District Court for	
19	the Northern District of California. On November 1, 2016, the Northern District transferred the	
20	case here finding that:	
21	A substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim(s) occurred, and the defendants named reside, in the counties	
22	of Solano and/or Sacramento, which lie within the venue of the Eastern District of California. See 28 U.S.C. § 84(b). Venue	
23		Eastern District. See id. § 1391(b).
24		
25	On November 1, 2016, plaintiff filed a motion asking that this matter be transferred back	
26	to the Northern District. Plaintiff's complaint essentially involves interviews conducted by	
27	certain defendants with plaintiff in order to determine plaintiff's suitability for parole. The	
28	interviews were conducted at plaintiff's place	e of incarceration. Plaintiff admits that when he filed 1

1	this action he was housed at California State Prison, Solano. But, he clarifies that in paragraph 3	
2	of his complaint he indicates "[d]uring all relevant times in this complaint, plaintiff was confined	
3	at "CTF-C," and that CTF-C is the Correctional Training Facility, in Soledad, California.	
4	Soledad lies in Monterey County which is within the jurisdiction of the Northern District. Also,	
5	there is no indication in the complaint where any defendant resides. ¹	
6	Because the events giving rise to plaintiff's claims occurred in Monterey County, and	
7	because a plaintiff's choice of forum receives deference in a motion for transfer of venue, <u>Decker</u>	
8	Coal Co. v. Commonwealth Edison Co., 805 F.2d 834, 843 (9th Cir. 1986), plaintiff's motion to	
9	transfer this action back to the Northern District will be granted.	
10	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:	
11	1. Plaintiff's motion to transfer venue (ECF No. 10) is granted; and	
12	2. This matter is transferred to the United States District Court for the Northern District of	
13	California.	
14	Dated: March 21, 2017 Carop U. Delany	
15	CAROLYN K. DELANEY	
16	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
17		
18		
19	1 gray2533.21	
20	gruj 2000.21	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27	$\frac{1}{1}$ Although a fair assumption is that defendant Shaffer, the head of the California Board of Parole	
28	Hearings, resides in Sacramento.	