Krohe v. Steinhardt

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

San Francisco Division

CHRISTOPHER D. KROHE,

Plaintiff,

v.

ZANDRA STEINHARDT,

Defendant.

Case No. <u>17-cv-03298-LB</u>

ORDER OF TRANSFER

Christopher David Krohe, an inmate at Mule Creek State Prison in Amador County, filed this civil action against Zandra Steinhardt, who resides in Fresno, California. Mr. Krohe consented to proceed before a magistrate judge. (ECF No. 4.)¹

In his complaint, Mr. Krohe alleges that he sent \$41,700.00 from his inmate trust account to Ms. Steinhardt to hold until the funds were needed to hire counsel for his habeas petition, with the understanding that Ms. Steinhardt would use that money to hire counsel for Mr. Krohe when the need arose. (ECF No. 1 at 4.) He further indicates that he wants Ms. Steinhardt to be ordered to hire an attorney for him. (Id.) (Federal court records show that Mr. Krohe's federal petition for

¹ Record citations refer to material in the Electronic Case File ("ECF"); pinpoint cites are to the ECFgenerated page numbers at the top of the documents.

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

writ of habeas corpus challenging his Orange County conviction for which he was sentenced to 76 years to life in prison was dismissed on September 2, 2016, because it was untimely under the federal habeas statute of limitations. See Krohe v. Lizarraga, C. D. Cal. Case No. 16-cv-00131-JGB-KS. The Ninth Circuit denied a certificate of appealability on April 14, 2017. See Krohe v. *Lizarraga*, Ninth Cir. Case No. 16-56398.)

The events and omissions giving rise to the complaint occurred in Fresno County or Amador County, both of which are located within the venue of the Eastern District of California. The defendant resides in Fresno County, which is located within the venue of the Eastern District of California. No defendant is alleged to reside in, and none of the events or omissions giving rise to the complaint are alleged to have occurred in, the Northern District of California. Venue is proper in the Eastern District, and not in the Northern District. See 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b). Accordingly, in the interest of justice and pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a), this action is TRANSFERRED to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California. The clerk shall transfer this matter. All pending motions will be decided in the Eastern District of California.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 29, 2017

United States Magistrate Judge