

**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

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.”).