

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

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  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

KEANA FISHER, Individually and on  
Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
ENTERPRISE RENT-A-CAR COMPANY  
OF LOS ANGELES,  
  
Defendants.

Case No. 3:[16-cv-05882-RS](#)

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO  
TRANSFER VENUE**

Plaintiff Keana Fisher originally filed this putative class action alleging violations of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (“FCRA”) and California’s Unfair Competition Law (“UCL”) in San Mateo County Superior Court. Defendant Enterprise Rent-A-Car Company of Los Angeles (“Enterprise”) removed the case to this court. Enterprise now moves, under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a), to transfer the litigation to the Central District of California. Fisher has not opposed the motion.


District courts have discretion in deciding whether to transfer litigation. *See Ventress v. Japan Airlines*, 486 F.3d 1111, 1118 (9th Cir. 2007) (“[w]eighing of the factors for and against transfer involves subtle considerations and is best left to the discretion of the trial judge”). In making the decision, courts may consider factors such as: the plaintiff’s choice of forum, the parties’ contacts with the forum, the contacts relating to the plaintiff’s cause of action in the chosen forum, the differences in the costs of litigation in the two forums, and the ease of access to the evidence. *Jones v. GNC Franchising, Inc.*, 211 F.3d 495, 498–99 (9th Cir. 2000).

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

While the plaintiff’s choice of forum deserves deference, the other factors weigh in favor of transfer here. Fisher resides in Riverside County in the Central District and Enterprise is headquartered in Orange County, also in the Central District. The parties executed the agreements at issue in the Central District. Fisher advances no facts to suggest that the Northern District is a more appropriate venue. *See Pac. Car & Foundry Co. v. Pence*, 403 F.2d 949, 954 (9th Cir. 1968) (dismissing where plaintiff made “no showing worth mentioning that its own convenience would be served by its choice of forum”). Moreover, given that Fisher has not opposed the motion, her choice of forum bears less weight. Accordingly, in the interests of justice, this action is transferred to the Central District of California.<sup>1</sup>

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: November 29, 2016

  
RICHARD SEEBORG  
United States District Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-1(b), this matter is suitable for disposition without oral argument. The December 15, 2016 hearing is thus vacated.