

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND  
Southern Division**

**MARVIN TUTT,  
Plaintiff,**

**Civil Action No. 8:25-cv-02006-TDC**

**v.**

**REGINA ROBINSON  
CHARLES COUNTY CHILD SUPPORT ADMINISTRATION  
CHARLES COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES  
CHARLES COUNTY, MARYLAND  
STATE OF MARYLAND  
SHARA GABRIELLE HENDLER, ESQ.  
ANDREA KHOURY  
MISTEY L. METZGAR  
1-30 Jane/John Does And/Or Entities  
THEODORE D. CHUANG**

**Defendants.**

---

# MOTION TO TRANSFER VENUE

**\*\*IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT\*\*  
\*\*FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND\*\***

**\*\*MARVIN TUTT\*\*  
\*Plaintiff,\***

**v.**

**\*\*STATE OF MARYLAND, et al.\*\*  
\*Defendants.\***

**\*\*Case No.: 8:25-cv-02006-TDC\*\***

**---**

**## MOTION TO TRANSFER VENUE PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a)**

Plaintiff Marvin Tutt respectfully moves this Court to transfer this action to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia or another appropriate non-Maryland venue, based on the interests of justice and the structural disqualification of the entire Maryland federal judiciary.

## ## I. INTRODUCTION

This motion arises from an unprecedented situation: On June 24, 2025, the United States Department of Justice filed litigation against all fifteen federal judges in the District of Maryland. This creates structural conflicts that prevent any Maryland federal judge from impartially presiding over cases involving Maryland state government, particularly those alleging governmental misconduct.

## ## II. LEGAL STANDARD

Under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a), "For the convenience of parties and witnesses, in the interest of justice, a district court may transfer any civil action to any other district or division where it might have been brought."

Courts consider multiple factors including:

- Plaintiff's choice of forum
- Convenience of parties and witnesses
- Interests of justice
- Administrative considerations
- Public confidence in judicial impartiality

\*Jumara v. State Farm Ins. Co.\*, 55 F.3d 873, 879 (3d Cir. 1995).

## ## III. THIS ACTION COULD HAVE BEEN BROUGHT IN E.D. VIRGINIA

### ### A. Venue Requirements Met

Under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), venue is proper where:

- A substantial part of events occurred
- Any defendant resides
- Any defendant is subject to personal jurisdiction

Several defendants conduct business in Virginia, and the interstate nature of the alleged misconduct (involving federal programs) extends across state lines.

### ### B. Personal Jurisdiction Exists

Defendants' participation in federal programs and interstate commerce provides sufficient contacts with Virginia.

## ## IV. THE INTERESTS OF JUSTICE REQUIRE TRANSFER

### ### A. Structural Disqualification of Maryland Judiciary

The DOJ litigation against all Maryland federal judges creates insurmountable conflicts:

- Every potential presiding judge is defending against federal charges
- Maryland judges cannot neutrally oversee Maryland corruption claims
- Public confidence requires judges without Maryland connections
- Appearance of impartiality cannot be maintained

### ### B. The Case Management Order Demonstrates Bias

Judge Chuang's July 8, 2025 Order, issued while defending against DOJ litigation:

- Imposed retroactive procedural requirements
- Created impossible "joint record" requirements for fraud cases
- Exempted prisoners from restrictions while applying them to non-prisoners
- Suggests predetermined outcome adverse to Plaintiff

### ### C. Public Confidence Requires Transfer

When an entire federal bench faces litigation, extraordinary measures preserve institutional integrity. The public cannot have confidence in proceedings where judges adjudicate cases affecting their co-defendants.

## ## V. CONVENIENCE FACTORS SUPPORT TRANSFER

### ### A. Geographic Accessibility

- E.D. Virginia (Alexandria) is only 45 miles from Baltimore
- Accessible via public transportation (MARC/Metro)
- Critical for Plaintiff with suspended license
- Closer than some Maryland courthouses

### ### B. Witness Availability

- Most witnesses are government employees
- Electronic testimony minimizes travel burden
- Documentary evidence predominates
- No significant inconvenience to any party

#### ### C. Administrative Efficiency

- E.D. Virginia's "rocket docket" ensures expeditious resolution
- Experienced with federal program litigation
- No backlog concerns
- Efficiency aligns with stated judicial concerns

### ## VI. PLAINTIFF'S CHOICE OF FORUM YIELDS TO JUSTICE

While plaintiff's choice typically receives deference, this yields when:

- Forum lacks connection to controversy
- Overriding interests of justice exist
- Structural conflicts prevent fair proceedings

Here, Plaintiff chose Maryland for proximity, not strategic advantage. That choice must yield to the paramount need for an impartial forum.

### ## VII. PROPOSED TRANSFER VENUES

In order of preference:

#### ### A. Eastern District of Virginia

- Geographically proximate
- Accessible via public transit
- Experienced with government litigation
- No Maryland judicial connections

### ## VIII. IMMEDIATE TRANSFER NECESSARY

Delay prejudices Plaintiff through:

- Continued proceedings before conflicted judges
- Weekly garnishments of \$130 depleting resources
- Risk of dispositive rulings by disqualified judge
- Erosion of public confidence

### ## IX. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests this Court:

1. **\*\*TRANSFER** this action**\*\*** to the Eastern District of Virginia pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a)
2. **\*\*STAY** all proceedings**\*\*** pending transfer
3. **\*\*EXPEDITE** the transfer**\*\*** given ongoing irreparable harm
4. **\*\*TRANSMIT** all records**\*\*** to the transferee court immediately
5. **\*\*GRANT** any other relief**\*\*** deemed just and proper

The interests of justice demand proceedings before judges without conflicts. Transfer is not merely appropriate—it is essential to maintaining public confidence in the federal judiciary.

**\*\*Respectfully submitted,\*\***

/s/ Marvin Tutt  
Marvin Tutt  
Pro Se Plaintiff  
Email: owner@caiatech.com

**\*\*Date:\*\*** July 15, 2025

---

#### **## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on July 15, 2025, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing Motion to Transfer Venue upon the following parties via certified mail and first-class mail:

Charles County Child Support Administration  
200 Kent Avenue  
La Plata, MD 20646

Charles County Department of Social Services  
200 Kent Avenue  
La Plata, MD 20646

State of Maryland  
c/o Office of the Attorney General  
200 Saint Paul Place  
Baltimore, MD 21202

Charles County, Maryland

200 Charles Street  
La Plata, MD 20646

Shara Gabrielle Hendler, Esq.  
c/o Charles County Child Support Administration  
200 Kent Avenue  
La Plata, MD 20646

Andrea Khoury  
c/o Charles County Circuit Court  
200 Charles Street  
La Plata, MD 20646

Mistey L. Metzgar  
c/o Charles County Circuit Court  
200 Charles Street  
La Plata, MD 20646

I certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

/s/ Marvin Tutt  
Marvin Tutt  
Pro Se Plaintiff  
Date: July 15, 2025

---

## ## MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT

### ### I. THE EXTRAORDINARY NATURE OF THE CONFLICT

Never before has an entire federal district bench been sued while presiding over related cases. This unprecedented situation demands unprecedented remedy: transfer to ensure impartial adjudication.

### ### II. RETROACTIVE ORDERS EVIDENCE PREJUDICE

The Case Management Order's retroactive application—issued after DOJ sued Judge Chuang—demonstrates how the conflict affects judicial decision-making. Requiring fraud victims to create "joint records" with alleged fraudsters shows either:

- Predetermined hostility to Plaintiff's claims
- Compromised judgment due to personal litigation stress
- Attempt to create procedural dismissal

Any explanation confirms transfer necessity.

### ### III. MARYLAND JUDGES CANNOT RULE ON THEIR OWN DISQUALIFICATION

Asking Maryland judges to rule on transfer motions involving their collective disqualification creates an impossible circular conflict. Only transfer to an unconflicted court can break this procedural paradox.

### #### IV. E.D. VIRGINIA OFFERS OPTIMAL SOLUTION

The Eastern District of Virginia provides:

- **\*\*Complete independence\*\*** from Maryland judicial networks
- **\*\*Geographic accessibility\*\*** for pro se litigant
- **\*\*Expeditious procedures\*\*** through rocket docket
- **\*\*Experience\*\*** with federal program litigation
- **\*\*Public transit access\*\*** from Maryland

### #### V. DELAY COMPOUNDS HARM

Every day before a conflicted judge:

- Deepens due process violations
- Risks void proceedings
- Wastes party resources
- Undermines public confidence

Immediate transfer prevents further damage.

### #### VI. CONCLUSION

The convergence of:

- DOJ litigation against all Maryland federal judges
- Plaintiff's case challenging Maryland corruption
- Judge Chuang's retaliatory case management order
- Ongoing garnishments causing irreparable harm

...creates compelling circumstances requiring transfer. No Maryland federal judge can provide the impartial forum the Constitution guarantees.

Justice delayed through conflicted proceedings is justice denied. Transfer must occur immediately.