

THE HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

LONNIE RAY TRAYLOR,

Plaintiff,

v.

MW PRINCE HALL GRAND
LODGE, and GREGORY D. WRAGGS,
SR.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C17-0815-JCC

ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff’s motion to transfer venue (Dkt. No. 2). Having thoroughly considered the parties’ briefing and the relevant record, the Court finds oral argument unnecessary and hereby DENIES the motion for the reasons explained herein.

Plaintiff moves to transfer this case to the Tacoma division under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a). Initially, the Court notes venue is proper here under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1) and (2). The complaint does not state where the discrimination took place, but Defendants and their meeting hall are located in Seattle, thus it is reasonable to infer the alleged discrimination took place in Seattle. (Dkt. No. 1 at 1.)

Plaintiff argues all of the evidence and witnesses with knowledge are located in Tacoma. (Dkt. No. 2 at 4–5.) “Ease of access to evidence is generally not a predominate concern in evaluating whether to transfer venue because ‘advances in technology have made it easy for

1 documents to be transferred to different locations.” *Byler v. Deluxe Corp.*, 222 F. Supp. 3d 885,
2 906–07 (S.D. Cal. 2016) (quoting *Metz v. U.S. Life Ins. Co. in City of New York*, 674 F. Supp. 2d
3 1141, 1148 (C.D. Cal. 2009)). Accordingly, Plaintiff’s argument that it will be easier to access
4 the evidence is not persuasive. (Dkt. No. 2 at 4.)

5 Furthermore, “before a court will grant a plaintiff’s motion for a change of venue, he
6 must first show a change in circumstances since the filing of his suit.” *James v. Daley & Lewis*,
7 406 F. Supp. 645, 648–49 (D. Del. 1976). Since filing his lawsuit, Plaintiff has not demonstrated
8 any “change in circumstances” that would justify the Court exercising its discretion. (*See* Dkt.
9 No. 2.) It would be unfair to allow Plaintiff, after filling in this division, to select another forum,
10 forcing Defendants to scramble to follow him.

11 For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff’s motion to transfer venue (Dkt. No. 2) is DENIED.

12
13 DATED this 14th day of July, 2017.

14
15
16 

17 John C. Coughenour
18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26