

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Mario Mendoza v. Luz Elvia Castillo

No. 2:25-cv-05621-WLH-JPR, United States District Court for the Central District of California (July 15, 2025)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California ordered Plaintiff Mario Mendoza to show cause why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over claims under California’s Unruh Civil Rights Act and related state law. The order requires Plaintiff and counsel to identify the statutory damages sought and submit declarations addressing whether they qualify as high-frequency litigants under California law.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	July 15, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-05621-WLH-JPR
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	After Plaintiff filed a complaint asserting an Americans with Disabilities Act claim for injunctive relief and an Unruh Civil Rights Act claim for damages, the district court issued an order to show cause regarding whether it should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claims.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district-court order to show cause
PARTIES	Mario Mendoza v. Luz Elvia Castillo, et al.

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil procedure
- Federal jurisdiction
- Disability-access litigation
- Civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's Unruh Civil Rights Act claim and any related state-law claims.
2. Whether Plaintiff and his counsel must provide information and declarations concerning the amount of statutory damages sought and whether Plaintiff qualifies as a California high-frequency litigant.

HOLDINGS

1. Supplemental jurisdiction is discretionary rather than a plaintiff's right, and a district court may decline to exercise it under the circumstances identified in 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c), while weighing judicial economy, convenience, fairness, and comity.
2. The court ordered Plaintiff and counsel to respond to the order to show cause, identify the statutory damages sought, and submit declarations under penalty of perjury containing facts necessary to determine whether Plaintiff satisfies California's definition of a high-frequency litigant.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"is a doctrine of discretion, not of plaintiff's right" (at 1)

"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." (at 2)

"the Court declines supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's Unruh Act claim." (at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged a violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act and sought injunctive relief. He also sought damages under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act and requested that the federal court exercise supplemental jurisdiction over that claim. The order indicates that the state-law claim may involve construction-related disability-access allegations and potentially implicate California's rules addressing high-frequency litigants.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The complaint invoked federal-question jurisdiction through the ADA claim and requested supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act claim under 28 U.S.C. § 1367. The court did not finally decide the jurisdictional issue; instead, it ordered Plaintiff to respond within fourteen days and warned that inadequate or untimely responses could lead to declining supplemental jurisdiction and dismissal of the state-law claims.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Carnegie-Mellon Univ. v. Cohill*, 484 U.S. 343, 350 (1988)
- *Acri v. Varian Assocs.*, 114 F.3d 999, 1000 (9th Cir. 1997)

- Schutza v. Cuddeback, 262 F. Supp. 3d 1025, 1031 (S.D. Cal. 2017)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-central-district-of-cal/2025/mario-mendoza-v-luz-elvia-castillo-4v5xaz00>