

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Redick III v. County of Tuolumne

Redick III · No. 2:25-cv-02530-ODW-BFM · Decided March 24, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California orders Plaintiff Stanley E. Redick III to show cause why his civil rights action should not be transferred to the Eastern District of California for improper venue. The court concludes that the alleged events and defendants appear connected to Tuolumne County and directs Plaintiff to respond by April 3, 2025.

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 WESTERN DIVISION 11 12 STANLEY E. REDICK, III, Case No. 2:25-cv-
02530-ODW-BFM 13 Plaintiff, ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE: 14 v. TRANSFER VENUE TO
EASTERN DISTRICT OF 15 COUNTY OF TUOLUMNE, et al., CALIFORNIA 16 Defendant.
17 18 19 On March 21, 2025, Plaintiff Stanley E. Redick III filed a civil rights 20 complaint in
this District.

(ECF 1.) In a declaration attached to the Complaint, 21 Plaintiff states that he was wrongfully
arrested for theft, and that the charges 22 were ultimately dismissed. (ECF 2 at 2.) Plaintiff claims
that the judge assigned 23 to the case, Tuolumne County Superior Court Judge Siebert, acted
improperly. 24 (ECF 2 at 2.) He alleges judicial and prosecutorial misconduct.

(ECF 1 at 3.) 25 Plaintiff names as Defendants Tuolumne County; Judge Siebert; and Judge 26
Laura Krieg, who prosecuted Plaintiff and is now a sitting superior court judge 27 in Tuolumne
County. (ECF 1 at 2.) Tuolumne County is in the Eastern District 28 1 2 The federal venue statute
requires that a civil action, other than one based 3 on diversity jurisdiction, be brought only in:
“(1) a judicial district in which any 4 defendant resides, if all defendants are residents of the State
in which the 5 district is located; (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events 6 or
omissions giving rise to the claim occurred...; or (3) if there is no district in 7 which an action may
otherwise be brought as provided in this section, any 8 judicial district in which any defendant is
subject to the court’s personal 9 jurisdiction with respect to such action.” 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).

10 Here, Judges Siebert and Craig sit in Tuolumne County, and there is no 11 reason to believe
that either of them resides in the Central District of California. 12 Moreover, from Plaintiff’s
description of his claims, there is no reason to think 13 that any relevant event happened in this
District.

Thus, there is no apparent 14 connection between the Central District of California and Plaintiff's claims and 15 no showing that venue lies in this District based on the requirements of 28 16 U.S.C. § 1391(b). 17 Plaintiff asserts that venue is proper in this District because the "County 18 of Tuolumne cannot provide an unbiased forum due to systemic misconduct and 19 entrenched conflicts of interest." (ECF 1 at 2.)

But Plaintiff has not explained 20 why the District Court located in the Eastern District of California—the federal 21 court that covers Tuolumne County—cannot hear his claim. In any event, these 22 allegations do not give the Court the authority to entertain this lawsuit. See 23 *Smith v. U.S. Dep't of Educ.*, No. C 07-04885CW, 2007 WL 4357546, at *1 (N.D. 24 Cal. Dec.

11, 2007). 25 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a), if venue does not properly lie in this 26 District, then the Court either must dismiss the action, or if it be in the interest 27 of justice, must transfer the action to the proper district. See *Starnes v. McGuire*, 28 1 2 it gives the parties an opportunity to be heard. *Costlow v. Weeks*, 790 F.2d 1486, 3 1488 (9th Cir.

1986). 4 The Court therefore notifies Plaintiff that it is considering transferring 5 his case to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California 6 where venue appears to lie. No later than April 3, 2025, Plaintiff is 7 therefore ORDERED to show cause—to explain in writing—why this action 8 should not be transferred on the basis of improper venue.

Failure to file a 9 timely response to this Order will result in the transfer of this action 10 for the reasons set forth above. 11 12 DATED: March 24, 2025

BRIANNA FULLER MIRCHEFF 13 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28