

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Mario Mendoza v. O-Nex Inc., Nabil Nassib Kaidbey, and Does 1 to
10

Mendoza v. O-Nex Inc. · No. 2:25-cv-04580-MEMF · Decided July 22, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California issued an order to show cause regarding whether it should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over state-law claims accompanying a claim under the Americans with Disabilities Act. The court directed the plaintiff and counsel to provide information and declarations concerning statutory damages and whether they qualify as high-frequency litigants under California law.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Maame Ewusi-Mensah Frimpong
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	July 22, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-04580-MEMF
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The plaintiff filed a federal ADA claim and related California state-law claims. The court issued an order to show cause why it should not decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claims.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Whether to exercise supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1367 is discretionary and requires consideration of judicial economy, convenience, fairness, and comity, including the circumstances identified in § 1367(c).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Mario Mendoza v. O-Nex Inc., Nabil Nassib Kaidbey, Does 1 to 10

TOPICS

subject matter jurisdiction

ada / disability

public accommodations discrimination

pleadings

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedure

Supplemental jurisdiction

Americans with Disabilities Act

California disability-access litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Mendoza's Unruh Civil Rights Act, California Disabled Persons Act, California Health and Safety Code, and negligence claims.
2. What information and declarations Mendoza and his counsel must provide to allow the court to determine whether they are high-frequency litigants under California law.

HOLDINGS

1. The court deferred resolution of supplemental jurisdiction and ordered Mendoza to show cause in writing why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act, California Disabled Persons Act, California Health and Safety Code, and negligence claims.
2. Mendoza must identify the statutory damages sought, and Mendoza and his counsel must submit declarations under penalty of perjury addressing the number of relevant construction-related accessibility claims filed or handled during the preceding twelve months.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“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 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Mendoza alleged that O-Nex Inc. and the other defendants violated the Americans with Disabilities Act and asserted related California claims involving alleged construction-related accessibility barriers. The complaint sought ADA injunctive relief and damages or injunctive relief under California law. The court noted that California imposes heightened pleading and disclosure requirements on certain construction-access claims brought by high-frequency litigants.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Mendoza filed the complaint on May 21, 2025, asserting an ADA claim for injunctive relief and state-law claims under the Unruh Civil Rights Act, the California Disabled Persons Act, California Health and Safety Code section 19955 et seq., and negligence. The court did not decide whether to exercise supplemental jurisdiction; instead, it required Mendoza and counsel to provide information and declarations concerning statutory damages and whether they qualified as high-frequency litigants.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- 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/2025/mario-mendoza-v-o-nex-inc-nabil-nassib-kaidbey-and-does-1-4zujruaq>