

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Barnes v. Napa State Hospital

Barnes · No. 2:25-cv-1192-JDP (P) · Decided April 28, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California determines that venue is improper because the defendant is located and the claims arose in Napa County, within the Northern District of California. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a), the court orders the action transferred to the Northern District of California.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jeremy D. Peterson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	April 28, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-1192-JDP (P)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff filed a pro se civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 without paying the filing fee or submitting an application to proceed in forma pauperis. The court addressed venue sua sponte and ordered transfer to the Northern District of California.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished and nonprecedential district court order

TOPICS

- venue
- civil rights
- section 1983
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights
- federal venue

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- 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 Northern 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 defendant was located in Napa County and the claim arose there, within 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; this action was transferred to the Northern District of California.

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.”” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff, a civil detainee proceeding pro se, brought a civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Napa State Hospital. The defendant was located in Napa County, and the claim arose there; Napa County is within the Northern District of California.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Antoine Barnes filed a civil rights action against Napa State Hospital in the Eastern District of California. The court determined that Napa County was the proper venue and transferred the matter to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California in the interest of justice.

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

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 ANTOINE BARNES, Case No. 2:25-cv-1192-JDP (P) 12 Plaintiff, 13 v.

ORDER 14 NAPA STATE HOSPITAL, 15 Defendant. 16 17 Plaintiff, a civil detainee proceeding pro se, has filed a civil rights action pursuant to 18 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff has neither filed an application to proceed in forma pauperis pursuant 19 to 28 U.S.C. § 1915 nor paid the filing fee for this action.

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 defendant is located, and the claim arose in Napa County, which is in the 28 Northern District of California. Therefore, plaintiff’s claim should have been filed in the United 1 | States District Court for the Northern District of California.

In the interest of justice, a federal 2 | court may transfer a complaint filed in the wrong district to the correct district. See 28 U.S.C. 3 | § 1406(a); *Starnes v. 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 Northern District of California. 6 7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: _ April 28, 2025 q——— 9 JEREMY D. PETERSON 10 UNITED STATES
MAGISTRATE JUDGE 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28