

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Jonathan Christopher Coffey v. Jose Duron, et al.

No. 2:25-cv-01296-EFB (PC) · No. 2:25-cv-01296-EFB (PC) · Decided September 17, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California determined that the plaintiff's § 1983 claim arose in Monterey County, within the Northern District of California. The court transferred the action to the Northern District of California under 28 U.S.C. § 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	September 17, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-01296-EFB (PC)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed a civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The district court determined that venue was improper in the Eastern District of California and ordered transfer to the Northern District of California.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; precedential status not stated.

TOPICS

venue civil procedure section 1983

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedure Prisoner civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether venue was proper in the Eastern District of California under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).
- Whether the action should be transferred to the Northern District of California under 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a) because the claim arose in Monterey County.

HOLDINGS

1. Venue was improper in the Eastern District of California because the claim arose in Monterey County, which is located in the Northern District of California.
2. When a civil action is filed in the wrong federal district, the court may transfer it to the proper district in the interest of justice under 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a).

KEY QUOTATIONS

“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.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff is a state prisoner who brought a civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The court determined that the claim arose in Monterey County, California. Because Monterey County lies within the Northern District of California, the court concluded that the action had been filed in the wrong federal district.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Jonathan Christopher Coffey filed a prisoner civil-rights complaint in the Eastern District of California. The court concluded that the claim arose in Monterey County, within the Northern District of California, and transferred the matter in the interest of justice under 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a).

DISPOSITION

other

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The matter was transferred to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California.

CASES CITED

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

OPINION

Duron

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 JONATHAN CHRISTOPHER COFFER, No. 2:25-cv-01296-EFB (PC)

12 Plaintiff, 13 v. ORDER 14 JOSE DURON, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 Plaintiff, a state
prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed a civil rights action pursuant to 18 42 U.S.C. § 1983. 19 The
federal venue statute provides that a civil action “may be brought in (1) a judicial 20 district in
which any defendant resides, if all defendants are residents of the State in which the 21 district is
located, (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions 22 giving rise
to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of property that is the subject of the action 23 is
situated, or (3) if there is no district in which an action may otherwise be brought as provided in 24
this action, any judicial district in which any defendant is subject to the court’s personal 25
jurisdiction with respect to such action.” 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b). 26 In this case, the claim arose in
Monterey County, which is in the Northern District of 27 California. Therefore, plaintiff’s claim
should have been filed in the United States District Court 28 for the Northern District of
California. In the interest of justice, a federal court may transfer a 1 || complaint filed in the wrong
district to the correct district. See 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a); Starnes v. 2 | McGuire, 512 F.2d 918, 932
(D.C. Cir. 1974). 3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this matter is transferred to the
United 4 | States District Court for the Northern District of California. Dated: September 16, 2025
_htiagl Ailna—

7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

8 9 10 1] 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28