

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Beagle Labs, Inc., et al. v. AppFolio, Inc.

Beagle Labs · No. 25-cv-10670-AMO · Decided December 19, 2025

SUMMARY

The court transfers Beagle Labs, Inc. and related plaintiffs’ action against AppFolio, Inc. from the Northern District of California to the Central District of California under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a). The court finds that the transferee district is more convenient for the parties, witnesses, and litigation, has less congested dockets, and better serves the interests of justice. The court also orders AppFolio to maintain the status quo pending further order of the transferee court.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Araceli Martinez-Olguin
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	December 19, 2025
DOCKET	25-cv-10670-AMO
DISPOSITION	remanded
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The plaintiffs filed an action asserting tortious interference, false advertising, unfair competition, monopolization, defamation, trade libel, unjust enrichment, and declaratory-judgment claims in the Northern District of California. After the plaintiffs filed an ex parte motion for a temporary restraining order, the court ordered briefing on whether the case should be transferred under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A transfer under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) is committed to the district court's discretion and depends on the facts of the particular case. The court must first determine whether the action could have been brought in the proposed transferee district, then weigh private convenience factors and public-interest factors concerning the interests of justice.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district-court order with no reported citation

PARTIES

Beagle Labs, Inc., Beagle Technologies, Inc., Big Beagle, Inc., Rental Property Managers Association LLC, YRIG Risk Retention Group, Inc. v. AppFolio, Inc.

TOPICS

venue

civil procedure

commercial litigation

torts

injunctions

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

commercial litigation

torts

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the action could have been brought in the Central District of California for purposes of 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a).
2. Whether the convenience of the parties and witnesses and the interests of justice favored transferring the action from the Northern District of California to the Central District of California.
3. Whether Defendant should be required to maintain the status quo pending further order of the transferee court.

HOLDINGS

1. The action could properly have been filed in the Central District of California because AppFolio resides there for venue purposes based on its principal place of business in Santa Barbara County.
2. Transfer to the Central District of California was warranted because the applicable convenience and interests-of-justice factors, including the location of relevant witnesses and conduct, relative docket congestion, and protection against forum shopping, favored the Central District.
3. Defendant was required to continue maintaining the status quo pending further order of the Central District of California.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“For the convenience of parties and witnesses, in the interest of justice, a district court may transfer any civil action to any other district or division where it might have been brought or to any district or division to which all parties have consented.” (at 1)

“Because the overall balance of applicable factors supports continuing this litigation in the United States District Court for the Central District of California, this action is TRANSFERRED to that district.” (at 7)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

AppFolio's principal place of business and headquarters are in Santa Barbara County, within the Central District of California. AppFolio submitted evidence that most employees with knowledge of the alleged conduct, business strategies, statements, and policies were based at that headquarters, and that the challenged statements and business decisions originated there rather than in the Northern District. The plaintiffs were primarily entities

based outside the Northern District, although they alleged business contacts, customers, and effects in the Bay Area.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs commenced the action on December 15, 2025, and sought a temporary restraining order the same day. Following a status conference, the court directed the parties to brief transfer to the Central District of California. The court transferred the action and ordered Defendant to maintain the status quo pending further order of the transferee court.

DISPOSITION

remanded

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The action was transferred to the United States District Court for the Central District of California. Defendant shall maintain the status quo pending further order of the transferee court; any alleged failure to maintain the status quo through December 22, 2025 may be raised before that court.

CASES CITED

- Jones v. GNC Franchising, Inc., 211 F.3d 495, 498-99 (9th Cir. 2000)
- State of Cal. v. Bureau of Land Mgmt., 286 F. Supp. 3d 1054, 1059 (N.D. Cal. 2018)
- Decker Coal Co. v. Commonwealth Edison Co., 805 F.2d 834, 843 (9th Cir. 1986)
- In re Link_A_Media Devices Corp., 662 F.3d 1221, 1223 (Fed. Cir. 2011)
- Thomas v. Twentieth Century Fox Film Corp., No. 21-CV-02720-LB, 2021 WL 2434032, at *3 (N.D. Cal. June 15, 2021)
- Park v. Dole Fresh Vegetables, Inc., 964 F. Supp. 2d 1088, 1093, 1095 (N.D. Cal. 2013)
- Los Angeles Mem'l Coliseum Comm'n v. Nat'l Football League, 89 F.R.D. 497, 501 (C.D. Cal. 1981)
- Metz v. U.S. Life Ins. Co. in City of New York, 674 F. Supp. 2d 1141, 1147 (C.D. Cal. 2009)
- Bhd. of Maint. of Way Employees Div./IBT v. Union Pac. R.R. Co., 485 F. Supp. 3d 1048, 1062 (D. Neb. 2020)
- Hendricks v. StarKist Co., No. 13-CV-729 YGR, 2014 WL 1245880, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 25, 2014)
- Buzzballz, LLC v. MPL Brands NV, Inc., 741 F. Supp. 3d 889, 897 (D. Nev. 2024)
- Sunbeam Prods., Inc. v. Homedics, Inc., 587 F. Supp. 2d 1055, 1058 (W.D. Wis. 2008)