

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.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Brianna Fuller Mircheff
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	March 24, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-02530-ODW-BFM
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court issued an order to show cause why the action should not be transferred to the Eastern District of California for improper venue.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the venue requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and the transfer-or-dismissal authority of § 1406(a).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order

TOPICS

- venue
- civil procedure
- civil rights

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

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

2. Whether the action should be transferred to the Eastern District of California under 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a) if venue was improper.

HOLDINGS

1. Based on the allegations then before it, the court found no apparent connection between the Central District of California and Plaintiff's claims and no showing that venue lay there under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).
2. If venue did not properly lie in the Central District, the court could dismiss the action or transfer it to the proper district in the interest of justice, and it gave Plaintiff an opportunity to show cause before deciding whether to transfer.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The federal venue statute requires that a civil action, other than one based in diversity jurisdiction, be brought only 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 (3) if there is no district in which an action may otherwise be brought as provided in this section, any judicial district in which any defendant is subject to the court’s personal jurisdiction with respect to such action.”” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged that he was wrongfully arrested for theft and that the charges were later dismissed. He asserted judicial and prosecutorial misconduct involving Tuolumne County Superior Court Judge Siebert and Judge Laura Krieg, and sued Tuolumne County and the two judges. The alleged defendants and events were connected to Tuolumne County, which lies in the Eastern District of California.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a federal civil-rights complaint in the Central District of California on March 21, 2025. Before service or a final disposition, the court reviewed venue and ordered Plaintiff to explain why the action should not be transferred under 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a).

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Smith v. U.S. Dep't of Educ., No. C 07-04885 CW, 2007 WL 4357546, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 11, 2007)
- Starnes v. McGuire
- Costlow v. Weeks, 790 F.2d 1486, 1488 (9th Cir. 1986)

