

AUSTIN DIVISION

Plaintiffs,

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:24-CV-335-ADA

Defendants.

ORDER

at the time in front of a different District Judge with a different practice. Moreover, the reassignment of this case was outside the parties' control. The situation the parties find themselves in now is entirely caused by the Court's desire to determine the appropriate venue for this case on a fulsome record—nothing attributable to the parties' actions or omissions prior to the reassignment of this case. Thus, Defendants' first argument is not persuasive.

Defendants' second argument concerning the appropriate standard of review fares no better. Even accepting Defendants' position that venue transfer is a non-dispositive pretrial matter, Rule 4(a) in Appendix C of the Local Rules of this Court permits the District Judge to reconsider *sue sponte* any non-dispositive matter considered by the Magistrate Judge. To avoid all doubt, the Court, pursuant to Rule 4(a) in Appendix C of the Local Rules of this Court and applying Defendants' position that venue transfer is a non-dispositive pretrial matter, hereby *sua sponte* reconsiders Defendants' Opposed Motion to Transfer Venue (ECF No. 33) and reaches the same conclusion that venue discovery is warranted.

It is therefore **ORDERED** that Defendants' Motion for Reconsideration (ECF No. 90) is **DENIED**.

SIGNED this 16th day of July, 2025.


ALAN D ALBRIGHT
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE