

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Rodriguez v. Nieves

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

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California determined that venue was improper because the defendants and the events underlying the 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claim were located in Los Angeles County. The court ordered the matter transferred to the United States District Court for the Central 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	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	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	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 district court sua sponte determined that venue was improper and transferred the action to the Central District of California.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; generally nonprecedential
PARTIES	Eric Anthony Rodriguez v. Nieves, et al.

TOPICS

- venue
- civil procedure
- section 1983
- prisoners rights

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil procedure
- Prisoner civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether venue was proper in the Eastern District of California under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).

2. Whether the action should be transferred to the Central 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 defendants were located in Los Angeles County and the claim arose there, placing the proper venue in the Central 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 this action was transferred to the United States District Court for the Central District of California.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“In the interest of justice, a federal court may transfer a complaint filed in the wrong district to the correct district.” (at 1)

“Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this matter is transferred to the United States District Court for the Central District of California.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Eric Anthony Rodriguez, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed a civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 in the Eastern District of California. The defendants were located in Los Angeles County, and the claim arose there. Because Los Angeles County is in the Central District of California, the court concluded that the action was filed in the wrong district.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed this § 1983 action in the Eastern District of California. 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. The court transferred the matter in the interest of justice.

DISPOSITION

other

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 4 a 1 Cnn Spe \L 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