

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Bernard Taruc v. JP Automotive Products, Inc. et al.

No. 2:25-cv-12332-SVW-MBK, United States District Court for the Central District of California (January 6, 2026)

SUMMARY

The Central District of California orders the parties to submit a joint status report addressing alleged ADA barriers, remedial measures, and potential summary judgment motions. The court also orders the plaintiff to show cause why it should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act and other state-law claims, and requires declarations concerning high-frequency litigant status and identification of statutory damages sought.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Stephen V. Wilson
JURISDICTION	U.S. District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	January 6, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-cv-12332-SVW-MBK
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court issued an order to show cause and ordered the parties to submit a joint status report before the initial status conference in an action asserting claims under Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act and related state-law claims.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

TOPICS

- ada / disability
- civil procedure
- summary judgment
- attorney fees
- damages

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil procedure
- Americans with Disabilities Act
- Supplemental jurisdiction
- Remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the parties should be required to report on investigation or remediation of the alleged ADA barriers and their anticipated summary-judgment motions.
2. Whether the plaintiff should show cause why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act and other state-law claims.
3. Whether voluntary removal of alleged ADA barriers, together with the unavailability of nominal damages under Title III, could moot the ADA claim and affect supplemental jurisdiction and attorney-fee entitlement.

HOLDINGS

1. The court ordered the parties to file a joint status report at least seven days before the initial status conference and ordered the plaintiff to respond within fourteen days explaining why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act and any other state-law claims.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“It is the policy of this Court to encourage expedient resolution of civil litigation.”

“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 state law claims and the dismissal of any such claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c).”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The plaintiff alleges barriers actionable under Title III of the ADA and appears also to assert an Unruh Act claim and other state-law claims. The order indicates that the defendant may have investigated or remedied the alleged barriers, potentially affecting whether the ADA claim remains justiciable. The court also sought information about the amount of statutory damages claimed and whether the plaintiff and counsel qualify as high-frequency litigants under California law.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action was pending in the Central District of California at the pretrial stage. The court directed the parties to report on measures taken to investigate or remedy alleged ADA barriers and whether they intended to move for summary judgment. The court separately ordered the plaintiff to show cause why supplemental jurisdiction should be exercised over the Unruh Act and any other state-law claims.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Oliver v. Ralphs Grocery Co.*, 654 F.3d 903, 905 (9th Cir. 2011)
- *American Cargo Transport, Inc. v. United States*, 625 F.3d 1176, 1179 (9th Cir. 2010)
- *Hillesheim v. Holiday Stationstores, Inc.*, 953 F.3d 1059, 1062 (8th Cir. 2020)

- G. v. Fay School, 931 F.3d 1, 11 (1st Cir. 2019)
- Brooke v. A-Ventures, LLC, 2017 WL 5624941, at *5 (D. Ariz. Nov. 22, 2017)
- Buckhannon Board & Care Home, Inc. v. West Virginia Department of Health & Human Resources, 532 U.S. 598 (2001)
- Molski v. Foster Freeze Paso Robles, 267 F. App'x 631, 632 (9th Cir. 2008)
- City of Chicago v. International College of Surgeons, 522 U.S. 156, 173 (1997)
- Carnegie-Mellon University v. Cohill, 484 U.S. 343, 350 (1988)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-central-district-of-cal/2026/bernard-taruc-v-jp-automotive-products-inc-et-al-4xeyp93k>