




of Law in Support of Mot. to Dismiss, ECF No. 10-1, at 4. Accordingly, this District is not the proper venue for this action.

The court declines to transfer this matter in the “interest of justice” to the District of Maryland. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a). “[D]ismissal is appropriate where the plaintiff’s claims have obvious substantive problems.” *Ananiev v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, 968 F. Supp. 2d 123, 132 (D.D.C. 2013) (internal quotation marks omitted). Here, Plaintiffs’ complaint, even read liberally, does not set forth a cognizable claim supported by well-pleaded facts. Transfer therefore is not in the interest of justice.

For the foregoing reasons, the court grants Defendants’ motions to dismiss, ECF Nos. 5, 9, 10, and denies Plaintiffs’ motions, ECF Nos. 1, 2, 3. A separate final order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Dated: October 21, 2019

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Amit P. Mehta  
United States District Court Judge