

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

STEVEN MICHAEL RINDAL,

Plaintiff,

v.

JAY ROBERT INSLEE, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:24-cv-00890-TL

ORDER ON MOTION FOR CHANGE  
OF VENUE

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Change of Venue. Dkt. No. 32 ("Demand for Change of Venue"). Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a), Plaintiff seeks to have this case transferred to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. *Id.* at 2. Having reviewed the Plaintiff's motion, Defendants' Response (Dkt. No. 36), and the relevant record, the Court DENIES the Motion.

**I. BACKGROUND**

This case arises from Plaintiff Steven Michael Rindal's allegations that the State of Washington violated his federal constitutional rights; committed against him the torts of tortious interference, defamation, and invasion of privacy; and violated Washington's Administrative

1 Procedure Act, RCW 34.05, when it revoked his license to practice chiropractic medicine during  
2 the COVID-19 pandemic. *See* Dkt. No. 18 at 2–6. On October 16, 2024, Plaintiff filed the instant  
3 motion, asserting that the “unique circumstances of this case and the potential conflicts of  
4 interest within the 9th Circuit” require that the Court transfer this case to the U.S. District Court  
5 for the District of Columbia. Dkt. No. 32 at 2.

## 6 II. LEGAL STANDARD

7 “For the convenience of parties and witnesses, in the interest of justice, a district court  
8 may transfer any civil action to any other district or division where it might have been brought or  
9 to any district or division to which all parties have consented.” 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a). As  
10 evidenced by their Response to Plaintiff’s Motion, Defendants do not consent to such a transfer.  
11 *See generally* Dkt. No. 36. Therefore, transfer is only appropriate to a district where this case  
12 might have been brought, and not to “any other district or division.” *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a).

13 The movant must show that the transferee district or division is one in which the suit  
14 could have been brought in the first instance—*i.e.*, that venue is proper in the transferee district.  
15 *See Commodity Futures Trading Comm’n v. Savage*, 611 F.2d 270, 279 (9th Cir. 1979). Venue is  
16 proper in:

- 17 (1) a judicial district in which any defendant resides, if all  
18 defendants are residents of the State in which the district is located;  
19 (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or  
20 omissions giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of  
21 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.

22 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).



1 marks omitted). None of the Defendants in the instant case is “essentially at home” in the District  
2 of Columbia. As to specific personal jurisdiction, the court may exercise it over a nonresident  
3 defendant where there is an “affiliation between the forum and the underlying controversy.”  
4 *Livnat v. Palestinian Auth.*, 851 F.3d 45, 56 (D.C. Cir. 2017). Here, no such affiliation exists:  
5 The state government has conducted its business from Olympia, Washington, and its agencies  
6 and officers have exclusively directed their inquiries and correspondence regarding the subject  
7 matter of the instant complaint toward Plaintiff and his business in Washington. *See, e.g.*, Dkt.  
8 No. 18 at 10, 67–111. In short, Plaintiff has not alleged any plausible connection between any  
9 Defendant and the District of Columbia.


10 Therefore, because the instant complaint could not have been brought in the District of  
11 Columbia, the Court finds it inappropriate to transfer the case there now. Accordingly, the Court  
12 DENIES Plaintiff’s Motion for Change of Venue (Dkt. No. 32).

13 **IV. CONCLUSION**

14 Accordingly, the Court orders as follows:

15 Plaintiff’s Motion for Change of Venue (Dkt. No. 32) is DENIED.

16  
17 Dated this 25th day of November 2024.

18   
19 \_\_\_\_\_  
20 Tana Lin  
21 United States District Judge  
22  
23  
24