

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Baggett v. Atascadero State Hospital

Baggett · No. 2:24-cv-02206-EFB (PC) · Decided May 7, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California ordered that the plaintiff's action be transferred to the Central District of California. The court concluded that the claim arose in San Luis Obispo County and that venue was therefore proper in the Central District under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and 1406(a).

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	May 7, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-02206-EFB (PC)
DISPOSITION	remanded
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff, an incarcerated person proceeding without counsel, filed a civil action and an application to proceed in forma pauperis. The court determined that venue was improper in the Eastern District of California and ordered transfer to the Central District of California.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order
PARTIES	Albert Anthony Baggett v. Atascadero State Hospital

TOPICS

- venue civil procedure prisoners rights civil rights

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil procedure Prisoner civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether venue was proper in the Eastern District of California under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).

2. Whether the action should be transferred to the Central District of California under 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a) because it was filed in the wrong district.

HOLDINGS

1. Venue was improper in the Eastern District of California because the claim arose in San Luis Obispo County, which is within the Central District of California.
2. The action should be transferred to the United States District Court for the Central District of California in the interest of justice.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The federal venue statute provides that a civil action “may be brought in (1) a judicial district in which any defendant resides, if all defendants are residents of the State in which the district is located, (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) if there is no district in which an action may otherwise be brought as provided in this action, any judicial district in which any defendant is subject to the court’s personal jurisdiction with respect to such action.”” (1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff was incarcerated at Atascadero State Hospital when he filed the complaint. The court determined that the claim arose in San Luis Obispo County, which is located in the Central District of California.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The complaint was filed in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California. The court found that the claim arose in San Luis Obispo County, within the Central District of California, and transferred the matter under 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a) in the interest of justice.

DISPOSITION

remanded

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

Transfer the matter to the United States District Court for the Central District of California.

CASES CITED

- Starnes v. McGuire, 512 F.2d 918, 932 (D.C. Cir. 1974)

OPINION

(PC) Baggett v. Atascadero State Hospital

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 ALBERT ANTHONY BAGGETT, No. 2:24-cv-02206-EFB (PC)

12 Plaintiff, 13 v. ORDER

14 ATASCADERO STATE HOSPITAL,

15 Defendants. 16

17 Plaintiff, incarcerated at Atascadero State Hospital at the time of filing of the complaint, 18
proceeds without counsel. Plaintiff has filed an application to proceed in forma pauperis pursuant
19 to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. 20 The federal venue statute provides that a civil action “may be brought
in (1) a judicial 21 district in which any defendant resides, if all defendants are residents of the
State in which the 22 district is located, (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the
events or omissions 23 giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of property that is the
subject of the action 24 is situated, or (3) if there is no district in which an action may otherwise be
brought as provided in 25 this action, any judicial district in which any defendant is subject to the
court’s personal 26 jurisdiction with respect to such action.” 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b). 27 In this case,
the claim arose in San Luis Obispo County, which is in the Central District of 28 California.
Therefore, plaintiff’s claim should have been filed in the United States District Court 1 | for the
Central District of California. In the interest of justice, a federal court may transfer a 2 || complaint
filed in the wrong district to the correct district. See 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a); Starnes v. 3 || McGuire,
512 F.2d 918, 932 (D.C. Cir. 1974). 4 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this matter is
transferred to the United 5 || States District Court for the Central District of California. 6 7 | Dated:
May 7, 2025 i Braden ‘ SEZ, □□□

8 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

9 10 1] 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28