

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

James D. Finley v. California Treatment Facility, et al.

Finley · No. 2:25-cv-2150 CSK P · Decided August 6, 2025

SUMMARY

The court determines that the plaintiff's § 1983 claim arose in Monterey County, which is located in the Northern District of California. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a), the court orders the action transferred to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Chi Soo Kim
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	August 6, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-2150 CSK P
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	A state prisoner proceeding pro se filed a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 civil rights action and an application to proceed in forma pauperis in the Eastern District of California. The court determined that venue was improper and transferred the action to the Northern District of California.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown
PARTIES	James D. Finley v. California Treatment Facility, et al.

TOPICS

- venue
- section 1983
- prisoners rights
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- prisoner civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether venue was proper in the Eastern District of California when the claim arose in Monterey County.

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 claim arose in Monterey County, which is located in the Northern District of California.
2. A federal court may transfer a complaint filed in the wrong district to the correct district in the interest of justice, and transfer to the Northern District of California was warranted here.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“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

James D. Finley, a state prisoner proceeding without counsel, brought a civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The opinion states that the claim arose in Monterey County, California, which lies within the Northern District of California. Finley filed the action in the Eastern District of California and also sought leave to proceed in forma pauperis.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a prisoner civil rights action in the Eastern District of California. Because the claim arose in Monterey County, the court concluded that the Northern District of California was the proper venue and transferred the matter there in the interest of justice under 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a).

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 JAMES D. FINLEY, No. 2:25-cv-2150 CSK P 12 Plaintiff, 13 v. ORDER 14
CALIFORNIA TREATMENT FACILITY, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 Plaintiff, a state prisoner
proceeding pro se, has filed a civil rights action pursuant to 42 18 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff has filed
in an application to proceed in forma pauperis pursuant to 28 19 U.S.C. § 1915.

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

In the interest of justice, a federal court may transfer a 2 | complaint filed in the wrong district to
the correct district. See 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a); *Starnes v. 3 || 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 || Dated: 08/06/25 C iy S \ [2 7 CHI SOO KIM g UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 9
10 || fini2150.21/2 1] 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28