

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JAMAR L. HENDRIX,
Plaintiff,
v.
RALPH DIAZ, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:20-cv-1739 KJN P

ORDER

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff filed an application to proceed in forma pauperis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

The federal venue statute provides that a civil action “may be brought in (1) a judicial district in which 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 action, any judicial district in which any defendant is subject to the court’s personal jurisdiction with respect to such action.” 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).

In this case, while some of the defendants work in Sacramento, two of the defendants are located and the claim arose in Riverside County, which is in the Central District of California.

1 Therefore, plaintiff's claim should have been filed in the United States District Court for the
2 Central District of California. In the interest of justice, a federal court may transfer a complaint
3 filed in the wrong district to the correct district. See 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a); Starnes v. McGuire,
4 512 F.2d 918, 932 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

5 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this matter is transferred to the United
6 States District Court for the Central District of California.

7 Dated: September 10, 2020

8 
9 _____
KENDALL J. NEWMAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10 /hend1739.21a
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28