

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Mario Mendoza v. Myong Nak Lee et al.

Mendoza v. Lee · No. CV 25-2473 PA (PDx) · Decided March 21, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California ordered the plaintiff to show cause why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over claims under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act and any other state-law claims. The court also required the plaintiff and counsel to submit declarations addressing whether they qualify as high-frequency litigants and to identify the statutory damages sought. A response was due April 4, 2025, with failure to respond potentially resulting in dismissal of the action or state-law claims.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Percy Anderson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	March 21, 2025
DOCKET	CV 25-2473 PA (PDx)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court issued an order to show cause requiring the plaintiff to explain why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Civil Rights Act claim and any other state-law claims.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Mario Mendoza v. Myong Nak Lee, et al.

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- civil procedure
- ada / disability
- public accommodations discrimination

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights
- Americans with Disabilities Act
- supplemental jurisdiction

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Civil Rights Act claim and any other state-law claims under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1367(a) and 1367(c).
2. What amount of statutory damages plaintiff seeks and whether plaintiff and counsel satisfy California's definition of a high-frequency litigant.

KEY QUOTATIONS

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

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The complaint alleges a violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act and seeks injunctive relief. It also seeks damages under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act and may assert other state-law claims. The court required information concerning the statutory damages sought and facts relevant to whether plaintiff and counsel qualify as high-frequency litigants under California law.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a complaint asserting a claim for injunctive relief under the Americans with Disabilities Act and a damages claim under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act. The court determined that it appeared to possess only supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claims and ordered plaintiff to respond by April 4, 2025. The court warned that failure to respond could result in dismissal without prejudice or declining supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claims.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- City of Chicago v. International College of Surgeons, 522 U.S. 156, 173, 118 S. Ct. 523, 534, 139 L. Ed. 2d 525 (1997)
- Carnegie-Mellon University v. Cohill, 484 U.S. 343, 350, 108 S. Ct. 614, 619, 98 L. Ed. 2d 720 (1988)