

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
WASHINGTON

Caryl Danita Carby v. Barrack Hussein Obama

Carby · No. 2:26-CV-0119-TOR · Decided April 21, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington denied Plaintiff Caryl Danita Carby’s pro se motion to change venue. The court held that the motion failed to provide supporting factual assertions and legal authority and did not identify a transferee venue, as required by the local rules.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington
DECIDED	April 21, 2026
DOCKET	2:26-CV-0119-TOR
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved to change venue after filing the complaint. The district court denied the motion.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown

TOPICS

venue civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure venue

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the plaintiff's motion to change venue should be granted when it lacks supporting factual assertions and legal authority and fails to identify a proposed transferee venue.

HOLDINGS

- A motion to change venue may be denied when the movant fails to provide the supporting factual assertions and legal authority required by the local rules and does not identify the venue to which the

action should be transferred.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A pro se litigant’s pleadings are “held to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers.””

“Pro se litigants are still expected to comply with the same rules of procedure that govern other litigants.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff asserted that the public was discussing her litigation even though she believed the litigation had not been publicized. She requested a change of venue but did not identify where the case should be transferred.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed the complaint on March 11, 2026, and moved to change venue the following day. The district court denied the motion because it lacked supporting factual assertions and legal authority and did not identify a proposed transferee venue.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007)
- King v. Atiyeh, 814 F.2d 565, 567 (9th Cir. 1987)

OPINION

Carby

PER CURIAM.

1 Apr 21, 2026

SEAN F. MCAVOY, CLERK

2 3 4

5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

6

7 CARYL DANITA CARBY,

NO. 2:26-CV-0119-TOR

8 Plaintiff,

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO

9 v. CHANGE VENUE

10 BARRACK HUSSEIN OBAMA,

11 Defendant. 12 BEFORE THE COURT is Plaintiff's Motion for Change of Venue (ECF No. 13 3). 14 Plaintiff filed a complaint on March 11, 2026 and filed a motion to change 15 venue the next day. Plaintiff requests a change in venue because the public is 16 talking about Plaintiff's litigation even though Plaintiff asserts it was never 17 publicized. However, Plaintiff does not say where the case should be transferred 18 to. 19 A pro se litigant's pleadings are "held to less stringent standards than formal 20 pleadings drafted by lawyers." *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007). However, pro se litigants are still expected to comply with the same rules of 21 procedure that govern other litigants. *King v. Atiyeh*, 814 F.2d 565, 567 (9th Cir. 1987). The local rules require a moving party to "set forth supporting factual 22 assertions and legal authority" in support of a motion. LCivR 7(b)(1). 23 Here, Plaintiff's motion fails to cite to the applicable facts and legal 24 authority as required under the local rules. And as stated, Plaintiff does not even 25 say where the action should be transferred to. 26 || ACCORDINGLY, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED: 27 1. Plaintiff's Motion for Change of Venue (ECF No. 3) is DENIED. 28 The District Court Executive is directed to enter this Order and furnish a 29 copy to Plaintiff 30 DATED April 21, 2026. <> United States District Judge 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40