

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Joseph Anthony Reyna, et al. v. 23andMe, Inc., et al.

Reyna · No. 26-cv-00464-EMC · Decided March 11, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California orders the sua sponte transfer of Joseph Anthony Reyna's case to the Eastern District of Missouri. The transfer is intended to facilitate referral to the bankruptcy court overseeing 23andMe's bankruptcy proceedings, after which the Northern District of California will administratively close the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Edward W. Chen
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	March 11, 2026
DOCKET	26-cv-00464-EMC
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court previously dismissed Plaintiff C.R.'s claims without prejudice and granted Joseph Anthony Reyna leave to proceed in forma pauperis, staying the required 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) review because 23andMe was involved in bankruptcy proceedings. The court then ordered, sua sponte, transfer of the action to the Eastern District of Missouri for referral to that district's bankruptcy court.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the discretionary transfer standard under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a), considering the convenience of the parties and witnesses and the interests of justice.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; precedential status not indicated.
PARTIES	Joseph Anthony Reyna, et al. v. 23andMe, Inc., et al.

TOPICS

- venue
- bankruptcy
- civil procedure
- automatic stay

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

bankruptcy

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should transfer the action sua sponte from the Northern District of California to the Eastern District of Missouri under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a).
2. Whether transfer was appropriate to facilitate referral of the action to the bankruptcy court handling 23andMe's bankruptcy proceedings in the Eastern District of Missouri.

HOLDINGS

1. The action should be transferred sua sponte to the Eastern District of Missouri because the interests of justice and convenience warranted having the case handled in the district where 23andMe's bankruptcy proceedings were pending.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“For the convenience of parties and witnesses, in the interest of justice, a district court may transfer any civil action to any other district or division where it might have been brought or to any district or division to which all parties have consented.” (at 1)

“Accordingly, the Court directs the Clerk of the Court to transfer this case to the Eastern District of Missouri in accordance with this order and then administratively close the file in this District.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs sued 23andMe, Inc. and other defendants in the Northern District of California. 23andMe was involved in bankruptcy proceedings pending in the Eastern District of Missouri under Bankruptcy Case Nos. 25-40976 and 25-40977. The court determined that the action should be transferred to Missouri so it could be referred to the bankruptcy court there.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action was pending in the Northern District of California. After dismissing C.R.'s claims and staying review of Reyna's in forma pauperis complaint due to 23andMe's bankruptcy proceedings in the Eastern District of Missouri, the court transferred the case to that district and directed administrative closure in California.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Overland Direct, Inc. v. Aframian, No. 2:22-cv-05510-AB-PD, 2023 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 39172, at *15 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 7, 2023)
- Malek, 591 B.R. 420, 426 (N.D. Cal. Bankr. Ct. 2018)

- SEC v. Ross, 504 F.3d 1130, 1149 (9th Cir. 2007)
- Dow Chem. Co. v. Calderon, 422 F.3d 827, 834 (9th Cir. 2005)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 6 7
JOSEPH ANTHONY REYNA, et al., Case No. 26-cv-00464-EMC 8 Plaintiffs, ORDER RE
TRANSFER 9 v. 10 23ANDME, INC., et al., 11 Defendants. 12 13 14 Previously, the Court
dismissed without prejudice all claims asserted by Plaintiff C.R.

The 15 Court also granted Plaintiff Joseph Anthony Reyna’s motion to proceed in forma pauperis
but 16 stayed its § 1915(e) review because 23andMe was in bankruptcy proceedings. See Docket
No. 23 17 (order). The bankruptcy proceedings are being conducted in the Eastern District of
Missouri (e.g., 18 Bankruptcy Case Nos. 25-40976, 25-40977). 19 The Court now, sua sponte,
orders that the instant case be transferred to the Eastern 20 District of Missouri so that it may then
be referred to the bankruptcy court in that District.

See 28 21 U.S.C. § 1404(a) (“For the convenience of parties and witnesses, in the interest of
justice, a district 22 court may transfer any civil action to any other district or division where it
might have been 23 brought or to any district or division to which all parties have consented.”); id.
§ 157(a) (“Each 24 district court may provide that any or all cases under title 11 and any or all
proceedings arising 25 under title 11 or arising in or related to a case under title 11 shall be
referred to the bankruptcy 26 judges for the district.”).¹ See, e.g., Overland Direct, Inc. v.
Aframian, No. 2:22-cv-05510-AB- 27] PD, 2023 U.S. Dist.

LEXIS 39172, at *15 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 7, 2023) (“[G]iven that the bankruptcy 2 || courts have
exclusive jurisdiction over all property of the Homesite Estate and that this case 3 || violates the
automatic stay, it follows that the interests of Justice and the convenience of the parties 4 || are best
served by transferring this case to the United States District Court for the Southern 5 || District of
California, for referral to that court's Bankruptcy Court.”).

6 Accordingly, the Court directs the Clerk of the Court to transfer this case to the Eastern 7 ||
District of Missouri in accordance with this order and then administratively close the file in this 8
|| District. 9 10 IT IS SO ORDERED. 1] a 12 Dated: March 11, 2026 EDWA. CHEN 15 United
States District Judge 16 17 Z 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 Malek, 591 B.R. 420, 426 (N.D.

Cal. Bankr. Ct. 2018); see also SEC v. Ross, 504 F.3d 1130, 1149 (9th Cir. 2007) (“In general, we
have held that a party has consented to personal jurisdiction when 26 || the party took some kind of
affirmative act — accepting a forum selection clause, submitting a claim, filing an action — that
fairly invited the court to resolve the dispute between the parties.”); 97 || Dow Chem.

Co. v. Calderon, 422 F.3d 827, 834 (9th Cir. 2005) (“[T]here is nothing unfair, or violative of due
process, about requiring a party that has affirmatively sought the aid of our courts 2g || with regard

to a particular transaction to submit to jurisdiction in the same forum as a defendant with regard to the same transaction with the same party.”).

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-northern-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-fo/2026/joseph-anthony-reyna-et-al-v-23andme-inc-et-al-xgyjf2zd>