

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

TODD A. LODHOLZ,

Plaintiff,

v.

CORRECTIONS CORPORATION OF AMERICA,
KAY HIGGINS and
JOHN DOE(S),

Defendants.

ORDER

03-C-0350-C

On November 24, 2003, I ordered that this case be transferred pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1631 to the United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma. Now, more than a month after the record was sent to the Oklahoma court, plaintiff has moved for reconsideration of the transfer order.

Generally, a district court relinquishes all jurisdiction over a case when it is transferred to another district court. See In re Joint E. & S. Dists. Asbestos Litig., 22 F.3d 755, 761-64 & n. 14 (7th Cir. 1994). Even if plaintiff could persuade me that the circumstances of his case militate in favor of exercising jurisdiction over his motion to reconsider, the motion would fail. Plaintiff argues that defendants “gave up change of

venue” when they contracted with the Wisconsin Department of Corrections to take charge of Wisconsin prisoners in Oklahoma. However, plaintiff has put in no evidence to suggest that the individual defendants personally entered into a contract with the state of Wisconsin Department of Corrections in which they agreed to be sued in the Western District of Wisconsin. Indeed, the transfer of this case was effected because defendants prevailed on a motion challenging this court’s ability to exercise personal jurisdiction over them. Because nothing in plaintiff’s present motion convinces me that defendants’ motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction was erroneous, no valid reason exists to reconsider the transfer order.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration of the decision to transfer his case to the District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma is DENIED.

Entered this 13th day of January, 2004.

BY THE COURT:

BARBARA B. CRABB
District Judge