

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

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