

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Mister Bailey v. Jayeshkumar Mukundbhai Bhavsar

Mister Bailey · No. CV 25-6346PA (BFMx) · Decided July 18, 2025

SUMMARY

The Central District of California orders 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 requires disclosure of the statutory damages sought and sworn declarations addressing whether the plaintiff and counsel qualify as high-frequency litigants under California law, with a response due August 1, 2025.

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	July 18, 2025
DOCKET	CV 25-6346PA (BFMx)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court issued an order to show cause requiring 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PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; precedential status unknown
PARTIES	Mister Bailey v. Jayeshkumar Mukundbhai Bhavsar, et al.

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil procedure
- Americans with Disabilities Act
- California civil rights law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiff should show cause why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Civil Rights Act claim and any other state-law claims.
2. What amount of statutory damages plaintiff seeks to recover.
3. Whether plaintiff and counsel must provide declarations addressing whether they meet 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 asserts a claim for damages under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act and potentially other state-law claims. The order does not provide additional underlying factual allegations.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a complaint asserting an ADA claim for injunctive relief and a California Unruh Civil Rights Act claim for damages. The court determined that it appeared to possess only supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claims and ordered plaintiff to respond in writing by August 1, 2025. No final dismissal or jurisdictional determination was entered in this order.

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)

OPINION

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL Case No. CV 25-6346PA (BFMx) Date July 18, 2025 Title Mister Bailey v. Jayeshkumar Mukundbhai Bhavsar, et al. Present: The Honorable PERCY ANDERSON, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE Kamilla Sali-Suleyman Not Reported Deputy Clerk Court Reporter / Recorder Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs: Attorneys Present for Defendants: None None Proceedings: IN CHAMBERS — ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE The Complaint filed in this action asserts a claim for injunctive relief arising out of an alleged violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”), 42 U.S.C. §§

12010-12213, and a claim for damages pursuant to California's Unruh Civil Rights Act ("Unruh Act"), Cal. Civ.

Code §§ 51-53. It appears that the Court possesses only supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act claim, and any other state law claim that plaintiff may have alleged, pursuant to the Court's supplemental jurisdiction. See 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a).

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.'" *City of Chicago v. Int'l Coll. of Surgeons*, 522 U.S. 156, 173, 118 S. Ct.

523, 534, 139 L. Ed. 2d 525 (1997) (emphasis added) (quoting *Carnegie-Mellon Univ. v. Cohill*, 484 U.S. 343, 350, 108 S. Ct. 614, 619, 98 L. Ed. 2d 720 (1988)). The Court therefore orders plaintiff to show cause in writing why the Court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act claim and any other state law claim asserted in the Complaint.

See 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c). In responding to this Order to Show Cause, plaintiff shall identify the amount of statutory damages plaintiff seeks to recover. Plaintiff and plaintiff's counsel shall also support their responses to the Order to Show Cause with declarations, signed under penalty of perjury, providing all facts necessary for the Court to determine if they satisfy the definition of a "high-frequency litigant" as provided by California Civil Procedure Code sections 425.55(b)(1) & (2).

Plaintiff shall file a Response to this Order to Show Cause by no later than August 1, 2025. Failure to timely or adequately respond to this Order to Show Cause may, without further warning, result in the dismissal of the entire action without prejudice or the Court declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act and other state law claims, if any, and the dismissal of any such claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c).