

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

NATHAN HILL,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
GAVIN NEWSOM, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. [23-cv-01997-JST](#)

**ORDER OF TRANSFER**

Plaintiff, an inmate housed at California State Prison – Los Angeles County in Los Angeles, California, has filed this action against the following defendants: California Governor Newsom, the State of California, California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitations (“CDCR”) Secretary Jeff Macomber, Los Angeles County Court House Corporation, the Pasadena Police Department, the Glendale Police Department, the Inmate Welfare Fund, CEO of the Bank of America and the Inmate Welfare Fund Brian Moynthan, the arresting agency of each plaintiff, every governor of California for the last 30 years, and every secretary of the CDCR for the last 30 years. It appears that Plaintiff seeks to bring a class action on behalf of all current and former prisoners. Plaintiff’s allegations are sprawling and numerous, and allege a grand conspiracy amongst all defendants against all prisoners throughout the state of California. Plaintiff has not identified any co-plaintiffs and the complaint is not signed by any potential co-plaintiffs. Plaintiff does not identify any specific violation of his constitutional or federal statutory rights that happened to him in this district.


Venue generally is proper in a judicial district in which: (1) any defendant resides, if all defendants are residents of the state in which the district is located; (2) a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of property that is the

1 subject of the action is situated; or (3) any defendant is subject to the court’s personal jurisdiction,  
2 if there is no district in which the action may otherwise be brought. 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b). In  
3 determining the appropriate venue, the Court does not consider the claims of the alleged co-  
4 plaintiffs because it is unclear who these co-plaintiffs are and whether they have consented to the  
5 filing of this action. Here, with respect to the alleged deprivation of Plaintiff’s constitutional or  
6 federal statutory rights, no specific events occurred in the Northern District of California and none  
7 of the defendants appear to reside in this district. Plaintiff currently is housed in Los Angeles  
8 County, and has named numerous agencies located in Los Angeles County. Los Angeles County  
9 lies within the venue of the Central District of California. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 84(c). Venue therefore  
10 properly lies in the Central District of California. *See id.* § 1391(b).

11 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that, in the interest of justice and pursuant to 28 U.S.C.  
12 § 1406(a), this action be TRANSFERRED to the United States District Court for the Central  
13 District of California. The Clerk is directed to close the case.

14 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

15 Dated: November 13, 2023

16   
17 JON S. TIGAR  
18 United States District Judge