

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.

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, 42 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* 27 1 || 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

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-central-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-for/2025/deondre-raglin-v-barstow-flower-shop-et-al-4rpn4cqa>