

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
NEW YORK

Madagoni v. Nissen et al.

Madagoni · No. 1:25-CV-10429 (LTS) · Decided January 16, 2026

SUMMARY

The court transfers Catherine Madagoni’s pro se civil action against Leif M. Nissen and Madagoni, LLC from the Southern District of New York to the District of New Jersey under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a). The court concludes that New Jersey is a proper and more convenient venue because the defendants and alleged events are located there, and it closes the action in the Southern District of New York.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of New York
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Laura Taylor Swain
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of New York
DECIDED	January 16, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-CV-10429 (LTS)
DISPOSITION	transferred
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff filed a pro se civil action in the Southern District of New York asserting claims under 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985, and 1986, RICO, other federal law, and state law. The court transferred the action to the District of New Jersey under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Venue and transfer under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1404(a); a district court has broad discretion in assessing convenience and fairness on a case-by-case basis.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court transfer order

TOPICS

- venue
- civil procedure
- section 1983

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- venue
- civil rights
- RICO

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Southern District of New York was a proper venue for Plaintiff's RICO and other civil claims under the applicable federal venue statutes.
2. Whether the action should be transferred to the District of New Jersey under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) for the convenience of the parties and witnesses and in the interest of justice.

HOLDINGS

1. The District of New Jersey was a proper venue for Plaintiff's RICO claims because both defendants allegedly resided, were found, had an agent, or transacted their affairs there, while the complaint did not show that either defendant had such a connection to the Southern District of New York.
2. The District of New Jersey was a proper venue for Plaintiff's remaining civil claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1) and (b)(2), because both defendants allegedly resided in New Jersey and a substantial part of the alleged events occurred there.
3. Transfer to the District of New Jersey was appropriate under § 1404(a) because the defendants, the alleged events, and likely relevant documents and witnesses were located there, making it a more convenient forum for all claims.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a), even if a civil action is filed in a federal district court where venue is proper, a court may transfer the action to any other federal district court where it might have been brought “[f]or the convenience of parties and witnesses, in the interest of justice.””

“The United States District Court for the District of New Jersey, which is a proper venue for all of Plaintiff’s claims, appears to be a more convenient forum for this action.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff, a New Jersey resident, sued a New Jersey family-division manager and a New Jersey limited liability company. She alleged that the defendants resided or conducted their affairs in New Jersey and that a substantial portion, if not all, of the events underlying her federal and state claims occurred there. She did not allege facts showing that either defendant or the relevant events were located in the Southern District of New York.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Catherine Madagoni filed the action in the Southern District of New York and alleged that both defendants were located in New Jersey and that the relevant events occurred there. The court concluded that the District of New Jersey was a proper and more convenient venue for all claims and ordered transfer; the action was closed in the Southern District of New York, and summonses were not to issue from that court.

DISPOSITION

transferred

CASES CITED

- Keitt v. N.Y. City, 882 F. Supp. 2d 412, 458-59 (S.D.N.Y. 2011)
- N.Y. Marine & Gen. Ins. Co. v. LaFarge N. Am., Inc., 599 F.3d 102, 112 (2d Cir. 2010)
- D.H. Blair & Co. v. Gottdiener, 462 F.3d 95, 106 (2d Cir. 2006)
- Coppedge v. United States, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-southern-district-of-new-york-united-states-district-court-for/2026/madagoni-v-nissen-et-al-iy2y7ccg>