

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

E. K. WADE,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
JEFF MILLER, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 2:13-cv-0861 MCE CKD PS

ORDER


Plaintiff is proceeding in this action pro se. The federal venue statute requires that a civil action, other than one based on diversity jurisdiction, be brought only in “(1) a judicial district where any defendant resides, if all defendants reside in the same State, (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) a judicial district in which any defendant may be found, if there is no district in which the action may otherwise be brought.” 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).

In this case, it appears that a substantial part of the events giving rise to plaintiff’s claims occurred in the District of Columbia. Plaintiff repeatedly references actions which occurred in the District of Columbia and the complaint expressly alleges that a substantial part of the events giving rise to the lawsuit occurred in the District of Columbia. Therefore, plaintiff’s claim should have been filed in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. In the interest of

1 justice, a federal court may transfer a complaint filed in the wrong district to the correct district.  
2 See 28 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 for the District of Columbia.

5 Dated: May 9, 2013



6 CAROLYN K. DELANEY  
7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28