


1 “[U]nless the balance of factors is strongly in favor of the defendant[], the plaintiff’s choice
2 of forum should rarely be disturbed.” *Sec. Inv. Protection Corp. v. Vigman*, 764 F.2d 1309,
3 1317 (9th Cir. 1985).

4 Defendant maintains the case should be transferred because the records and
5 witnesses are located in the Central District. (*See* Decl. of Mariano Berreiro.) Defendant
6 refers to three witnesses, all of whom are referenced in the complaint. (*Id.*) On the other
7 hand, Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se*, resides and is employed in this district. It would be a
8 significant burden in time and expenses for her to litigate in the Central District, and it may
9 make it impossible for her to maintain this action there. (Opp’n at 2.) Weighing against
10 transfer is the relative means of the parties.

11 The balance of factors does not strongly favor Defendant, and the transfer would not
12 be in the interests of justice. Accordingly, Defendant’s motion is **DENIED**.

13 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

14 DATED: September 8, 2008

15 
16 M. James Lorenz
United States District Court Judge

17 COPY TO:
18 HON. BARBARA L. MAJOR
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
19 ALL PARTIES/COUNSEL
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28