

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Deondre Raglin v. Barstow Flower Shop, et al.

Raglin v. Barstow Flower Shop · No. 5:25-cv-02017-JAK-DTB · Decided August 13, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California ordered Plaintiff Deondre Raglin to show cause why the court should not decline supplemental jurisdiction over his California state-law accessibility claims. The order discusses California’s heightened pleading requirements and high-frequency litigant provisions for construction-related accessibility claims. Plaintiff was directed to identify the statutory damages sought and submit a declaration addressing whether he qualifies as a high-frequency litigant.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	John A. Kronstadt
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	August 13, 2025
DOCKET	5:25-cv-02017-JAK-DTB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court issued an order to show cause why it should not decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's California state-law claims.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Supplemental jurisdiction is discretionary; the court must consider whether related state-law claims form part of the same Article III case or controversy and, in deciding whether to exercise jurisdiction, consider judicial economy, convenience, fairness, and comity.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished federal district court order; precedential status is unknown and the order is not a final merits decision.

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedure

Supplemental jurisdiction

Americans with Disabilities Act

California civil rights law

Construction accessibility litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c) in light of California's heightened requirements for construction-related accessibility claims and Plaintiff's alleged status as a high-frequency litigant.

HOLDINGS

1. Supplemental jurisdiction over related state-law claims is discretionary rather than a right of the plaintiff, and the court may consider judicial economy, convenience, fairness, and comity at every stage of the litigation.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“This “is a doctrine of discretion, not of plaintiff’s right.”” (at 1)

“In order to decide whether to exercise jurisdiction over pendent state law claims, a district court should consider . . . at every stage of the litigation, the values of judicial economy, convenience, fairness, and comity.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complaint alleged violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the California Unruh Civil Rights Act, and other California laws arising from alleged construction-related accessibility issues. The court's docket review showed that Plaintiff had filed more than ten construction-related accessibility actions in the District during the year preceding this action, which would qualify Plaintiff as a high-frequency litigant in California Superior Court. The court expressed concern that exercising supplemental jurisdiction could allow a high-frequency plaintiff to avoid California's heightened pleading and fee requirements by proceeding in federal court.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a federal action asserting claims under the Americans with Disabilities Act and California law, invoking supplemental jurisdiction for the state-law claims. After reviewing the Complaint and the District's docket, the court ordered Plaintiff to explain why the state-law claims should not be dismissed without prejudice under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c). The court directed Plaintiff and Defendant to file responses before taking the matter under submission.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- United Mine Workers v. Gibbs, 383 U.S. 715, 726 (1966)
- Nishimoto v. Federman-Bachrach & Assocs., 903 F.2d 709, 715 (9th Cir. 1990)
- Whitaker v. RCP Belmont Shore LLC, No. LA CV19-09561 JAK (JEMx), 2020 WL 3800449, at *6-8 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 30, 2020)
- Garibay v. Rodriguez, No. 2:18-cv-09187-PA (AFMx), 2019 WL 5204294, at *1-6 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 27, 2019)
- Perri v. Thrifty Payless, No. 2:19-CV-07829-CJC (SKx), 2019 WL 7882068, at *2 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 8, 2019)

OPINION

Deondre Raglin v. Barstow Flower Shop

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

10 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11

DEONDRE RAGLIN, No. 5:25-cv-02017-JAK-DTB

12 Plaintiff, ORDER RE TO SHOW CAUSE RE:

13 SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION

v. OVER STATE-LAW CLAIMS

14 BARSTOW FLOWER SHOP., et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 18 Based on a review of the
Complaint (Dkt. 1), the following determinations are 19 made: 20 The Complaint alleges
violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 21 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq. (the “ADA”), the
Unruh Civil Rights Act (the “Unruh Act”), Cal. 22 Civ. Code §§ 51–55 and other provisions of
California law. Supplemental jurisdiction is 23 the basis for the state-law claims. Dkt. 1 ¶ 7. 24
District courts may exercise “supplemental jurisdiction over all other claims that 25 are so related
to claims in the action within such original jurisdiction that they form part 26 of the same case or
controversy under Article III of the United States Constitution.” 28 27 U.S.C. § 1367(a). This “is a
doctrine of discretion, not of plaintiff’s right.” United Mine 1 Workers v. Gibbs, 383 U.S. 715, 726
(1966). “In order to decide whether to exercise 2 jurisdiction over pendent state law claims, a
district court should consider . . . at every 3 stage of the litigation, the values of judicial economy,
convenience, fairness, and 4 comity.” Nishimoto v. Federman-Bachrach & Assocs., 903 F.2d 709,
715 (9th Cir. 1990) 5 (citation omitted).

6 In 2012, California imposed heightened pleading requirements for Unruh Act

7 claims. Cal. Civ. Code § 55.52(a)(1); Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 425.50(a). In 2015, 8 California also
imposed a “high-frequency litigant fee” for plaintiffs and law firms that 9 have brought large
numbers of construction-related accessibility claims. Cal. Gov’t Code 10 70616.5. As detailed in
previous orders by this Court and other district courts in 11 California, these reforms addressed the
small number of plaintiffs and counsel who bring 12 a significant percentage of construction-

related accessibility claims. E.g., *Whitaker v. 13 RCP Belmont Shore LLC*, No. LA CV19-09561 JAK (JEMx), 2020 WL 3800449, at *6– 14 8 (Mar. 30, 2020); *Garibay v. Rodriguez*, No. 2:18-cv-09187-PA (AFMx), 2019 WL 15 5204294, at *1–6 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 27, 2019). These statutes impose special requirements 16 for construction-related accessibility claims brought by high-frequency plaintiffs 17 pursuant to the Unruh Act. Because accepting supplemental jurisdiction over such claims 18 would permit high-frequency plaintiffs to side-step those state-law requirements by 19 pursuing the claims in a federal forum, many district courts, including this one, have 20 declined to exercise such jurisdiction. E.g., *Whitaker*, 2020 WL 3800449, at *6–8; 21 *Garibay*, 2019 WL 5204294, at *1–6. 22 A review of the docket in this District shows that, in the one-year period preceding 23 the filing of the Complaint, Plaintiff has filed more than ten actions in which he has 24 advanced construction-related accessibility claims. In a California Superior Court, 25 Plaintiff would be deemed a high-frequency litigant. Therefore, “California’s recent 26 legislative enactments confirm that the state has a substantial interest in this case.” *Perri v. Thrifty Payless*, No. 2:19-CV-07829-CJC (SKx), 2019 WL 7882068, at *2 (C.D. Cal. 2 || Oct. 8, 2019). 3 In light of the foregoing, Plaintiff is ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE why the 4 | Court should not decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claims. 5 || Plaintiff shall file a response to this Order to Show Cause, not to exceed ten pages, on or 6 || before August 27, 2025. In responding to this Order to Show Cause, Plaintiff shall 7 || identify the amount of statutory damages Plaintiff seeks to recover. Plaintiff shall also 8 || present a declaration, signed under penalty of perjury, providing the evidence necessary 9 || for the Court to determine if Plaintiff meets the definition of a “high-frequency litigant” as defined in Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 425.50(b)(1) & (2). Failure to file a timely response 11 || to this Order to Show Cause may result in the dismissal of the state-law claims without 12 || prejudice by declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over them, pursuant to 28

13. || U.S.C. § 1367(c). Defendant may also file a response to this Order to Show Cause, not to || exceed ten pages, on or before September 3, 2025. Upon receipt of the response(s), the 15 matter will be taken under submission, and a written order will issue. 16

17. | ITISSO ORDERED.

18 19 Yo Dated: August 13, 2025 C] I John A. Kronstadt United States District Judge