

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

---

**PABLO HUERTAS, et al.,**

**Plaintiffs,**

**v.**

**CARRIE WARD, et al.,**

**Defendants.**

---

)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

**Case No. 19-cv-02570 (APM)**

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Plaintiffs Pablo and Elsa Huertas bring this action arising out of the foreclosure of their home in Maryland. *See* Compl., ECF No. 1. They claim, in essence, that the foreclosure was illegally secured based on Defendants’ filing of false documents in the Circuit Court for Montgomery County. *See id.* ¶ 12. They assert a host of claims—some actual causes of action, some not—that generally sound in tort, though they also claim a violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983. *See id.* at 1, 11–13.


The court grants Defendants’ motion to dismiss this action for lack of venue. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a). None of the grounds for proper venue obtain in this District. None of the defendants reside here; they are all residents of Maryland. *See* Compl. at 1. None of the alleged conduct occurred here; it all occurred in Maryland. *See generally id.* Nor is the subject property located here; it is in Maryland. *See* Carrie Ward’s Mem. of Law in Support of Mot. to Dismiss, ECF No. 5-1, at 1. Furthermore, this action may “otherwise be brought” in the District of Maryland. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(3); *see also* State of Maryland & Montgomery County Sherriff’s Mem.

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