

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
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JAMES SMITH,
Plaintiff,
v.
ANTHONY LEWIS,
Defendant.

No. 2:15-cv-0517 TLN CKD PS

ORDER

Plaintiff is proceeding in this action pro se. Plaintiff alleges diversity as the basis for subject matter jurisdiction. The federal venue statute provides that a civil action may be brought only in “(1) a judicial district where any defendant resides, if all defendants are residents of the State in which the district is located; (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of property that is the subject of the action is situated; or (3) if there is no district in which an action may otherwise be brought as provided in this section, any judicial district in which any defendant is subject to the court’s personal jurisdiction with respect to such action.” 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).


In this action, defendant resides in Louisville, Kentucky and the internet activity complained of originated from that location. Therefore, plaintiff’s claim should have been filed in the United States District Court, Western District of Kentucky. In the interest of justice, a

////

1 federal court may transfer a complaint filed in the wrong district to the correct district. See 28
2 U.S.C. § 1406(a); Starnes v. McGuire, 512 F.2d 918, 932 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this matter is transferred to the United
4 States District Court, Western District of Kentucky, Louisville Division.

5 Dated: March 10, 2015



CAROLYN K. DELANEY
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

8 4 smith0517.tra

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28