

**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

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 JONATHAN CHRISTOPHER COFFEY, 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 _htia gl 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