

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
EASTERN DIVISION

ANGELA FAYE ROBERTS,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	No.: 11-2830-JDB-egb
)	
CORRECTIONS CORPORATION OF)	
AMERICA,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO CHANGE VENUE

Before the Court is Plaintiff’s Motion for a Change of Venue [D.E. 42]. Defendant has responded in opposition [D.E. 49]. The undersigned considers this via a referral pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 631-39 [D.E. 31] and Administrative Order 2013-05. The Motion is DENIED.

As an initial matter, Plaintiff did not submit a certificate of consultation along with her Motion as required by Local Rule 7.2(a)(1)(B). As stated in this Local Rule, “[f]ailure to attach an accompanying certificate of consultation may be deemed good grounds for denying the motion.”

Second, Plaintiff fails to cite any intelligible reason for venue change. While she states that she has undue hardship, none of the reasons she relies upon, such as access to the ECF or the fact that legal counsel has been denied and discovery allegedly withheld, are issues that a venue change would remedy. In addition to failing to provide support for her request, Plaintiff does not even state in her Motion which venue she would prefer.

Moreover, as Defendant points out, this case is properly before the United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee, Eastern Division. This case arises from Plaintiff's employment with the Hardeman County Correctional Facility, and Hardeman County Correctional Facility is located in Whiteville, Hardeman County, Tennessee. *See* D.E. 11. Hardeman County is located in the Eastern Division of the Western District of Tennessee. *See* 28 U.S.C. §123(c)(1); Local Rule 3.3(a). Therefore, this case is in the proper court and transferring venue to a different district would be improper. *See* 28 U.S.C. §1391(b)(1), (2) (2011). Finally, Defendant illustrates that the majority of the factors a court considers when deciding a motion to transfer venue weigh in favor of this case remaining in the Eastern Division of the Western District of Tennessee.

For all these reasons, Plaintiff's Motion is DENIED.

s/Edward G. Bryant
EDWARD G. BRYANT
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Date: **August 28, 2013**