

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
NEW YORK

Jacqueline Chatman v. Mario Julien, et al.

Chatman · No. 1:25-cv-643-GHW · Decided January 15, 2026

SUMMARY

The Southern District of New York transferred Jacqueline Chatman’s pro se action to the Eastern District of New York under 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a) because venue did not lie in the Southern District and the relevant parties and events were located in Queens. The court also certified that any appeal would not be taken in good faith and denied in forma pauperis status for purposes of appeal.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of New York
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Gregory H. Woods
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of New York
DECIDED	January 15, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-cv-643-GHW
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Pro se employment-related civil action transferred sua sponte for improper venue under 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a) after plaintiff failed to respond to an order to show cause.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished and nonprecedential district court order
PARTIES	Jacqueline Chatman v. Mario Julien, Suan Johnson, Margrett Thompson, et al.

TOPICS

- venue
- civil procedure
- employment discrimination
- hostile work environment

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- employment law
- civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether venue was proper in the Southern District of New York.

2. Whether the action should be transferred to the Eastern District of New York under 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a) when venue did not lie in the Southern District and the interests of justice favored transfer.
3. Whether plaintiff should be denied in forma pauperis status for an appeal because any appeal would not be taken in good faith.

HOLDINGS

1. Venue did not lie in the Southern District of New York because the complaint did not establish that venue was proper there and the relevant parties and events were associated with Queens, New York.
2. The action was properly transferred to the Eastern District of New York under 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a) because venue did not lie in the Southern District and the interest of justice favored transfer to the district encompassing the proper venue.
3. Plaintiff was denied in forma pauperis status for purposes of an appeal because the court certified that any appeal would not be taken in good faith.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Because venue does not lie in this district, and the interest of justice weighs in favor of transferring the case to the district that encompasses the court identified as the proper venue, this case is hereby transferred under 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a) to the Eastern District of New York.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged that defendants subjected her to harassment and discrimination, created a hostile work environment, defamed her character, and violated her FMLA rights. Plaintiff and the identified defendants resided in Queens, New York, and the court determined that the underlying events appeared to have occurred in the Eastern District of New York rather than the Southern District of New York.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff commenced the action in the Southern District of New York on January 22, 2025. The court issued an order to show cause regarding venue and proposed transfer to the Eastern District of New York; plaintiff did not respond, and the court transferred the case to the Eastern District of New York.

DISPOSITION

other

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The Clerk of Court was directed to transfer the case to the Eastern District of New York without delay and mail a copy of the order to plaintiff.

CASES CITED

- *Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT ELECTRONICALLY FILED DOC #:
_____ SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK DATE FILED: 1/15/2026 -----

----- X JACQUELINE CHATMAN,; Plaintiff,; 1:25-cv-
643-GHW -against-: ORDER MARIO JULIEN, et al.,; Defendants.: -----

----- X GREGORY H. WOODS, United States District Judge: Plaintiff
commenced this action pro se on January 22, 2025, alleging among other things that Defendants
subjected her to “harassment and discrimination,” created a “hostile environment,” “defamed [her]
character,” and violated her “FMLA [rights].” Compl. at 1, 5.

Because Plaintiff and Defendants Mario Julien, Suan Johnson, and Margrett Thompson all reside
in Queens, New York, and because it appears the underlying actions at issue in this case occurred
in the same location, not this District, the Court issued an order to show cause as to why this case
should not be transferred to the Eastern District of New York on January 30, 2025.

Dkt. No. 4. In that order, the Court noted that the complaint “does not expressly allege that venue
is proper in this district.” Id. at 1. The Court also noted that “the Court is inclined to transfer this
case to the Eastern District of New York pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a).” Id. Finally, the order
gave Plaintiff until no later than February 14, 2025 to show cause as to why the case should not be
transferred to the Eastern District of New York (or to consent to transfer).

Id. at 2; see 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a). Plaintiff has not responded to the order to show cause. Because
venue does not lie in this district, and the interest of justice weighs in favor of transferring the case
to the district that encompasses the court identified as the proper venue, this case is hereby
transferred under 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a) to the Eastern District of New York.

The Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that any appeal from this order would not
be taken in good faith, and therefore in forma pauperis status is denied for the purpose of an
appeal. See *Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962).

The Clerk of Court is directed to transfer this case to the Eastern District of New York without
delay. The Clerk of Court is directed to mail a copy of this order to Plaintiff. SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 15, 2026 New York, New York _____

GREGORY H. WOODS United States District Judge