


1 the...district of confinement rule[] to core habeas petitions filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §
2 2241, including those filed by immigrant detainees.”). Rather, because Petitioner is
3 currently incarcerated at a detention facility within the Eastern District of California, and
4 was so detained at the time this action was opened, jurisdiction would lie within that
5 district.

6 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a), the Court “of a district in which is filed a case
7 laying venue in the wrong division or district shall dismiss, or if it be in the interest of
8 justice, transfer such case to any district or division in which it could have been brought.”
9 The decision to transfer under section 1404(a) lies within the discretion of the district court
10 and is to be determined upon notions of convenience and fairness on a case-by-case basis.
11 *Stewart Org., Inc. v. Ricoh Corp.*, 487 U.S. 22, 29 (1988). In the interest of justice and
12 convenience, this Court will transfer this case to the United States District Court for the
13 Eastern District of California.

14 **ACCORDINGLY, IT IS ORDERED** that:

- 15 (1) Respondents’ Motion to Transfer (Doc. 10) is **granted**.
16 (2) The Clerk of Court must transfer this action to the United States District
17 Court for the Eastern District of California.

18 Dated this 4th day of February, 2026.

19
20
21 
22 Honorable Susan M. Brnovich
23 United States District Judge
24
25
26
27
28