

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Eugene Price v. Guerrez, et al.

Price v. Guerrez · No. 2:25-cv-1094-JDP (P) · Decided April 22, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California determined that the defendants and events underlying the plaintiff’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action were located in Los Angeles County, within the Central District of California. The court transferred the matter to the Central District of California under 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a) and addressed venue without deciding the merits of the claims.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jeremy D. Peterson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	April 22, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-1094-JDP (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 determined that venue was improper and ordered the action transferred to the Central District of California.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court transfer order with no reporter citation or stated precedential status.
PARTIES	Eugene Price v. Guerrez, et al.

TOPICS

- venue
- section 1983
- prisoners rights
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights
- prisoner civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. 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 and the claim arose in Los Angeles County, which is within the Central District of California.
2. When a civil action is filed in the wrong federal district, the court may transfer it to the proper district in the interest of justice under 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a).

KEY QUOTATIONS

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

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Eugene Price, a state prisoner proceeding without counsel, filed a civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The defendants were located in Los Angeles County, and the claim arose there. Los Angeles County is within the Central District of California rather than the Eastern District, where the action was filed.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed the action in the Eastern District of California. Because the defendants were located and the claim arose in Los Angeles County, the court found that the Central District of California was the proper venue and transferred the matter in the interest of justice under 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a).

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

Eugene Leon Price v. Guerrez

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 EUGENE PRICE, Case No. 2:25-cv-1094-JDP (P) 12 Plaintiff, 13 v. ORDER 14
GUERREZ, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed a
civil rights action pursuant to 18 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff has filed an application to proceed in
forma pauperis pursuant to 19 28 U.S.C. § 1915. 20 The federal venue statute provides that a civil
action “may be brought in (1) a judicial 21 district in which any defendant resides, if all
defendants are residents of the State in which the 22 district is located, (2) a judicial district in
which a substantial part of the events or omissions 23 giving rise to the claim occurred, or a
substantial part of property that is the subject of the action 24 is situated, or (3) if there is no
district in which an action may otherwise be brought as provided in 25 this action, any judicial
district in which any defendant is subject to the court’s personal 26 jurisdiction with respect to
such action.” 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b). 27 In this case, the defendants are located and the claim arose
in Los Angeles County, which 28 is in the Central District of California. Therefore, plaintiff’s
claim should have been filed in the 1 | United States District Court for the Central District of
California. In the interest of justice, a 2 | federal court may transfer a complaint filed in the wrong
district to the correct district. See 3 | 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a); Starnes v. McGuire, 512 F.2d 918, 932
(D.C. Cir. 1974). 4 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this matter is transferred to the
United 5 | States District Court for the Central District of California. 6 | IT IS SO ORDERED. 7 / .
8 | Dated: _ April 21, 2025 _ gene Ws

JEREMY D. PETERSON

9 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28