

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

McKinney v. Walker

McKinney · No. 2:25-cv-2842 CKD P · Decided October 7, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California orders the transfer of a state prisoner’s 28 U.S.C. § 2254 habeas corpus petition to the Central District of California. The court concludes that the Central District is the more appropriate forum because the petitioner was convicted in Los Angeles County and relevant witnesses and evidence are more readily available there.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Carolyn K. Delaney
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	October 7, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-2842 CKD P
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed an application for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The court ordered the action transferred to the United States District Court for the Central District of California.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court transfer order
PARTIES	Alonzo McKinney v. J. Walker

TOPICS

- federal habeas corpus
- venue
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- federal habeas corpus
- venue

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Eastern District of California should transfer the § 2254 habeas action to the Central District of California because the conviction occurred in Los Angeles County and the relevant witnesses and evidence were more readily available there.

HOLDINGS

1. A § 2254 habeas action may proceed in either the federal district where the petitioner was convicted or the district where the petitioner is incarcerated, and transfer to the district connected to the conviction is appropriate when the relevant witnesses and evidence are more readily available there.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Accordingly, in the furtherance of justice, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this matter is transferred to the United States District Court for the Central District of California.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner is a state prisoner incarcerated at R.J. Donovan Correctional Facility in San Diego County. He is serving a sentence arising from a conviction in the Los Angeles County Superior Court. The court determined that witnesses and evidence necessary to resolve the habeas application were more readily available in Los Angeles County.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

McKinney filed a federal habeas petition in the Eastern District of California challenging a conviction from the Los Angeles County Superior Court. Because the witnesses and evidence relevant to the petition were more readily available in Los Angeles County, the court transferred the matter to the Central District of California in the furtherance of justice.

DISPOSITION

other

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The matter was transferred to the United States District Court for the Central District of California for further proceedings.

CASES CITED

- *Braden v. 30th Judicial Circuit Court*, 410 U.S. 484 (1973)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 ALONZO MCKINNEY, No. 2:25-cv-2842 CKD P 12 Petitioner, 13 v.
ORDER 14 J. WALKER, 15 Respondent. 16 17 Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has

filed an application for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Petitioner is presently incarcerated at R.J.

Donavan 19 Correctional Facility in San Diego County. He is serving a sentence for a conviction from the 20 Los Angeles County Superior Court. The general rule regarding habeas applications is that both 21 the United States District Court in the district where petitioner was convicted and the District 22 Court where petitioner is incarcerated have jurisdiction over the claims.

See *Braden v. 30th 23 Judicial Circuit Court*, 410 U.S. 484 (1973). Because any witnesses and evidence necessary for 24 the resolution of petitioner's application are more readily available in Los Angeles County, *id.* at 25 499 n.15; 28 U.S.C. § 2241(d), this action will be transferred to the United States District Court 26 for the Central District of California.

27 // 28 //] Accordingly, in the furtherance of justice, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this matter is 2 || transferred to the United States District Court for the Central District of California. 3 | Dated: October 6, 2025 Card ft 4 by ae 4 CAROLYNK. DELANEY SOS 5 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 6 7 8 | inuy 9 mcki2842.108a 10 1] 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28