

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Sadowski v. Yang

Sadowski · No. 2:25-cv-2051 SCR P · Decided August 4, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California determined that venue was improper because the defendants and events underlying the plaintiff’s § 1983 claim were located in San Diego County. The court ordered the action transferred to the United States District Court for the Southern District of California under 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a).

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sean C. Riordan
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	August 4, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-2051 SCR P
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed a civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and an application to proceed in forma pauperis. The court determined that venue was improper in the Eastern District of California and ordered transfer to the Southern District of California.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court order with no reported citation
PARTIES	William Sadowski v. Marvin Yang, et al.

TOPICS

- venue
- civil procedure
- section 1983
- prisoners rights

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- prisoner civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether venue was proper in the Eastern District of California or should be transferred to the Southern District of California.
2. Whether the action should be transferred under 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a) because it was filed in the wrong federal district.

HOLDINGS

1. Venue was improper in the Eastern District of California because the defendants were located and the claim arose in San Diego County, which is within the Southern District of California.
2. A federal court may transfer an action filed in the wrong district to the proper district in the interest of justice, and this action should be transferred to the Southern 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.”” (1)

“Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this matter is transferred to the United States District Court for the Southern District of California.” (1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff is a state prisoner who filed a civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The opinion states that the defendants were located in San Diego County and that the claim arose there, placing the relevant conduct in the Southern District of California.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Sadowski filed a § 1983 action in the Eastern District of California. The court found that the defendants and the events underlying the claim were located in San Diego County, making the Southern District of California the proper venue, and transferred the matter in the interest of justice.

DISPOSITION

other

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

Transfer the matter to the United States District Court for the Southern 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 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 9 10 WILLIAM SADOWSKI, No. 2:25-cv-2051 SCR P 11 Plaintiff, 12 v. ORDER
13 MARVIN YANG, et al., 14 Defendants. 15 16 Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has
filed a civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. 17 § 1983. Plaintiff has filed an application to proceed in
forma pauperis under 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

18 The federal venue statute provides that a civil action “may be brought in (1) a judicial 19
district in which any defendant resides, if all defendants are residents of the State in which the 20
district is located, (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions 21
giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of property that is the subject of the action
22 is situated, or (3) if there is no district in which an action may otherwise be brought as provided
in 23 this action, any judicial district in which any defendant is subject to the court’s personal 24
jurisdiction with respect to such action.” 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).

25 In this case, the defendants are located and the claim arose in San Diego County, which is 26 in
the Southern District of California. Therefore, plaintiff’s claim should have been filed in the 27
United States District Court for the Southern District of California.

In the interest of justice, a 28 federal court may transfer a complaint filed in the wrong district to
the correct district. See 28 1 | U.S.C. § 1406(a); *Starnes v. McGuire*, 512 F.2d 918, 932 (D.C. Cir.
1974). 2 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this matter is transferred to the United 3 ||
States District Court for the Southern District of California. 4 | DATED: August 4, 2025 fonfob 6
SEAN C. RIORDAN 7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28