

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PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; precedential status unknown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)