

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Nash v. Honeywell International Inc.

No. 2:24-cv-02952-DAD-AC (E.D. Cal. Dec. 16, 2025) · No. 2:24-cv-02952-DAD-AC · Decided December 17,
2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California granted Honeywell International Inc.'s motion to transfer venue under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a). The court concluded that the District of Arizona was more appropriate because the plaintiff primarily lived and worked there, the dispute principally arose there, Arizona was more familiar with potentially applicable law, and the District of Arizona had a less congested docket. The court ordered the action transferred to the District of Arizona and directed the clerk to close the case after forwarding the filings.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Dale A. Drozd
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	December 17, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-02952-DAD-AC
DISPOSITION	transferred
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Motion to transfer venue under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a)
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

TOPICS

- venue forum non conveniens civil procedure employment law

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure employment law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the case should be transferred to the District of Arizona under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) for convenience of parties and witnesses and in the interest of justice

HOLDINGS

1. The motion to transfer venue is granted because Arizona is the state most familiar with the governing law, plaintiff's choice of forum is accorded little weight, Arizona is more convenient for witnesses, has greater local interest, and is less congested.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a), 'a district court may transfer any civil action to any other district or division where it might have been brought' for the convenience of parties and witnesses and in the interest of justice." (at 1)

"Because Arizona is the state most familiar with the governing law, plaintiff's choice of forum is accorded little weight, the District of Arizona is more convenient for the identified witnesses, Arizona has a greater interest in having the local controversy decided at home, and the District of Arizona is less congested than this court, and despite the convenience of the parties and the parties' contacts favoring denial of transfer, the court will grant defendant's motion to transfer venue to the District of Arizona." (at 11)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff Daniel Nash worked for defendant Honeywell International Inc. since 2015. After a new Vice President arrived, tensions increased. Plaintiff announced retirement but agreed to extend service until August 2nd. During extended period, work environment became hostile with expense report refusals. Plaintiff was abruptly terminated on July 29th for alleged misuse of documents, then pressured with threats of criminal prosecution if he didn't sign legal documents.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed action in Placer County Superior Court; defendant removed to federal court based on diversity jurisdiction. Defendant moved to transfer venue to the District of Arizona.

DISPOSITION

transferred

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The Clerk of the Court for the Eastern District of California is ordered to forward all filings to the United States District Court for the District of Arizona and close the case upon completion of transfer.

CASES CITED

- Van Dusen v. Barrack, 376 U.S. 612 (1964)
- Stewart Org., Inc. v. Ricoh Corp., 487 U.S. 22 (1988)
- Robert Bosch Healthcare Sys., Inc. v. Cardiocom, LLC, No. 3:14-cv-01575-EMC, 2014 WL 2702894 (N.D. Cal. June 13, 2014)
- Park v. Dole Fresh Vegetables, Inc., 964 F. Supp. 2d 1088 (N.D. Cal. 2013)

- Hatch v. Reliance Ins. Co., 758 F.2d 409 (9th Cir. 1985)
- Commodity Futures Trading Comm'n v. Savage, 611 F.2d 270 (9th Cir. 1979)
- Jones v. GNC Franchising, Inc., 211 F.3d 495 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Cochran v. NYP Holdings, Inc., 58 F. Supp. 2d 1113 (C.D. Cal. 1998)
- Atlantic Marine Const. Co. v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for W. Dist. of Tex., 571 U.S. 49 (2013)
- Citizens for Free Speech, LLC v. Cnty. of Alameda, 338 F. Supp. 3d 995 (N.D. Cal. 2018)
- Lou v. Belzberg, 834 F.2d 730 (9th Cir. 1987)
- Williams v. Bowman, 157 F. Supp. 2d 1103 (N.D. Cal. 2001)
- A.F.P. v. United States, No. 1:21-cv-00780-DAD-EPG, 2022 WL 2704570 (E.D. Cal. July 12, 2022)
- Passantino v. Johnson & Johnson Consumer Prods., Inc., 212 F.3d 493 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Sloan v. Pfizer, Inc., No. 08-cv-01849-SBA, 2008 WL 4167083 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 8, 2008)
- Ironworkers Loc. Union No. 68 & Participating Emps. Health and Welfare Fund v. Amgen, Inc., No. 2:07-cv-05157-PSG-AGR, 2008 WL 312309 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 22, 2008)
- Jaco Env't Inc. v. Appliance Recycling Ctrs. of Am., Inc., No. 3:06-cv-06601-JSW, 2007 WL 951274 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 27, 2007)
- Gates Learjet Corp. v. Jensen, 743 F.2d 1325 (9th Cir. 1984)
- DeFazio v. Hollister Emp. Share Ownership Tr., 406 F. Supp. 2d 1085 (E.D. Cal. 2005)
- Saleh v. Titan Corp., 361 F. Supp. 2d 1152 (S.D. Cal. 2005)
- New Show Studios, LLC v. Howe, 696 F. App'x 271 (9th Cir. 2017)
- Walters v. Famous Transports, Inc., 488 F. Supp. 3d 930 (N.D. Cal. 2020)