

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Eric Anthony Rodriguez v. Nieves

Rodriguez v. Nieves · No. 2:25-cv-1873 CSK P · Decided July 17, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California ordered the transfer of Eric Anthony Rodriguez’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action to the Central District of California. The court determined that the defendants and alleged events were located in Los Angeles County, making the Central District the proper venue under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), and transferred the matter under 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a).

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	July 17, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-1873 CSK P
DISPOSITION	remanded
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 Central District of California.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished, nonprecedential district court order

TOPICS

- venue
- section 1983
- prisoners rights
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil procedure
- Civil rights
- Prisoner civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether venue was proper in the Eastern District of California or whether the action should be transferred to the Central District of California under 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a).

HOLDINGS

1. Venue was improper in the Eastern District of California because the defendants were located in Los Angeles County and the claim arose there, within the Central District of California.
2. The action should be transferred to the United States District Court for the Central District of California in the interest of justice.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“In this case, the defendants are located in and the claim arose in Los Angeles County, which is in the Central District of California.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding without counsel and brought a civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The court found that the defendants were located in Los Angeles County and that the claim arose there, making the Central District of California the proper venue.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed this civil rights action in the Eastern District of California. Because the defendants were located in Los Angeles County and the claim arose there, the court transferred the matter to the Central District of California in the interest of justice under 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a).

DISPOSITION

remanded

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The matter is transferred to the United States District Court for the Central 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 ERIC ANTHONY RODRIGUEZ, No. 2:25-cv-1873 CSK P 11 Plaintiff, 12 v. ORDER 13 NIEVES, et al., 14 Defendants. 15 16 Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed a civil rights action pursuant to 17 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff has filed an application to proceed in forma pauperis pursuant to 18 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

19 The federal venue statute provides that a civil action “may be brought in (1) a judicial 20 district in which any defendant resides, if all defendants are residents of the State in which the 21 district is located, (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions 22 giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of property that is the subject of the action 23 is situated, or (3) if there is no district in which an action may otherwise be brought as provided in 24 this action, any judicial district in which any defendant is subject to the court’s personal 25 jurisdiction with respect to such action.” 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).

26 In this case, the defendants are located in and the claim arose in Los Angeles County, 27 which is in the Central District of California. Therefore, plaintiff’s claim should have been filed 28 in the United States District Court for the Central District of California.

In the interest of justice, 1 | a federal court may transfer a complaint filed in the wrong district to the correct district. See 2 | 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a); *Starnes v. McGuire*, 512 F.2d 918, 932 (D.C. Cir. 1974). 3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this matter is transferred to the United 4 | States District Court for the Central District of California. 5 6 || Dated: July 17, 2025 1 ☐☐☐ Spo | CHI SOO KIM 8 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 9 10 rodr1873.21a/2 1] 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28