

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Robert Cauley v. Auto Explosion, Inc.

Cauley v. Auto Explosion · No. 2:25-cv-4443-MEMF · Decided June 3, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California ordered Robert Cauley to show cause why the court should not decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over his California state-law claims. The court directed Cauley and his counsel to provide information and declarations concerning statutory damages and whether they qualify as high-frequency litigants under California law.

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 Case No.: 2:25-cv-4443-MEMF 11 ROBERT CAULEY, 12 Plaintiff, ORDER
TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THE COURT SHOULD NOT DECLINE TO 13 v. EXERCISE
SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION OV ER PLAINTIFF’S 14 STATE LAW CLAIMS AUTO
EXPLOSION, INC.; ESTEBAN 15 PIMENTEL; and DOES 1 to 10, 16 Defendants. 17 18 19 20
On May 16, 2025, Robert Cauley filed a Complaint against Auto Explosion, Inc.; Esteban 21
Pimentel; and Does 1 to 10 (“Defendants”) asserting: (1) a claim for injunctive relief arising out of
22 an alleged violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”), 42 U.S.C. §§ 12010–
12213; 23 (2) a claim for damages pursuant to California’s Unruh Civil Rights Act (“Unruh Act”),
Cal. Civ.

24 Code §§ 51–52, et seq.; (3) a claim for damages pursuant to the California Disabled Persons
Act, 25 Cal. Civ. Code §§ 54, et seq.; (4) a claim for damages and injunctive relief based on
California 26 Health and Safety Code § 19955, et seq.; (5) a claim for damages for negligence.
ECF No. 1.

The 27 Complaint alleges that this Court has jurisdiction over the ADA claim pursuant to 28
U.S.C. §§ 1331 28 1 and 1343, and that the state law claims are brought “pursuant to pendant [sic]
jurisdiction.” Id. at ¶¶ 2 6–7. 3 Principles of pendent jurisdiction have been codified in the
supplemental jurisdiction statute, 4 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

The supplemental jurisdiction statute “reflects the understanding that, when 5 deciding whether to
exercise supplemental jurisdiction, ‘a federal court should consider and weigh in 6 each case, and
at every stage of the litigation, the values of judicial economy, convenience, fairness, 7 and

comity.’” *City of Chicago v. Int’l Coll. of Surgeons*, 522 U.S. 156, 173 (1997) (emphasis added) 8 (quoting *Carnegie-Mellon Univ. v. Cohill*, 484 U.S. 343, 350 (1988)).

9 California law sets forth a heightened pleading standard for a limited group of lawsuits 10 brought under the Unruh Act. See Cal. Civ. Proc. Code §§ 425.55(a)(2) & (3). The stricter pleading 11 standard requires certain plaintiffs bringing construction-access claims like the one in the instant 12 case to file a verified complaint alleging specific facts concerning the plaintiff’s claim, including the 13 specific barriers encountered or how the plaintiff was deterred and each date on which the plaintiff 14 encountered each barrier or was deterred.

See Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 425.50(a). A “high-frequency 15 litigant fee” is also imposed on certain plaintiffs and law firms bringing these claims. See Cal. Gov’t 16 Code § 70616.5. A “high-frequency litigant” is “a plaintiff who has filed 10 or more complaints 17 alleging a construction-related accessibility violation within the 12-month period immediately 18 preceding the filing of the current complaint alleging a construction-related accessibility violation” 19 and “an attorney who has represented as attorney of record 10 or more high-frequency litigant 20 plaintiffs in actions that were resolved within the 12-month period immediately preceding the filing 21 of the current complaint alleging a construction-related accessibility violation.” Cal. Civ.

Proc. Code 22 §§ 425.55(b)(1) & (2). High frequency litigants are also required to state: (1) whether the complaint 23 is filed by, or on behalf of, a high-frequency litigant; (2) in the case of a high-frequency litigant who 24 is a plaintiff, the number of complaints alleging construction-related accessibility claim filed by the 25 high-frequency litigant during the 12 months prior to filing the instant complaint; (3) the reason the 26 individual was in the geographic area of the defendant’s business; and (4) the reason why the 27 individual desired to access the defendant’s business.” See *id.* § 425.50(a)(4)(A).

28 | In light of the foregoing, the Court orders Cauley to show cause in writing why the Court 2 | should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act claim, the California Disabled Persons 3 || Act claim, the California Health and Safety Code claim, and the negligence claim. See 28 U.S.C. § 4 | 1367(c).

In responding to this Order to Show Cause: 5 1. Cauley shall identify the amount of statutory damages Cauley seeks to recover. 6 2. Cauley and his counsel shall also support their responses to the Order to Show Cause with 7 declarations, signed under penalty of perjury, providing all facts necessary for the Court to 8 determine if they satisfy the definition of a “high-frequency litigant” as provided by 9 California Code of Civil Procedure §§ 425.55(b)(1) & (2).

This includes, but is not limited 10 to: 11 a. the number of construction-related accessibility claims filed by Cauley in the twelve 12 months preceding the filing of the present claim; and 13 b. the number of construction-related accessibility claims in which Cauley’s counsel has 14

represented high-frequency litigant plaintiffs in the twelve months preceding the 15 filing of the present claim.

16 Cauley shall file a Response to this Order to Show Cause by no later than fourteen days from 17 || the date of this order. The failure to timely or adequately respond to this Order to Show Cause may, 18 || without further warning, result in the Court declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the 19 | Unruh Act claim, the California Disabled Persons Act claim, the California Health and Safety Code 20 || claim, and the negligence claim pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c).

21 22 IT IS SO ORDERED. 23 24 ~ 25 Dated: June 3, 2025 26 MAAME EWUSI-MENSAH
FRIMPONG 27 United States District Judge 28