

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Yuri Doering v. Juan Garcia

No. CV 25-5430-MWF(JCx), United States District Court for the Central District of California (June 20, 2025)

SUMMARY

This document is an order to show cause issued in a federal civil action involving claims under the Americans with Disabilities Act, the California Unruh Civil Rights Act, and other state laws. The court directs the plaintiff to explain why supplemental jurisdiction should be exercised and to provide information concerning statutory damages and high-frequency litigant status by July 7, 2025.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Michael W. Fitzgerald
DECIDED	June 20, 2025
DOCKET	CV 25-5430-MWF(JCx)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court issued an order to show cause requiring Plaintiff to explain why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over claims under the California Unruh Civil Rights Act and other state-law claims.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order
PARTIES	Yuri Doering v. Juan Garcia

TOPICS

subject matter jurisdictioncivil procedureada / disability

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedurecivil rightsdisability discrimination

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the district court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act claim and other state-law claims.

2. Whether Plaintiff must provide information concerning the amount of Unruh Act damages sought and whether Plaintiff or counsel qualifies as a high-frequency litigant under California Code of Civil Procedure section 425.55.

HOLDINGS

1. The district court may and must independently examine whether subject matter jurisdiction exists during the pendency of the action, including whether supplemental jurisdiction should be exercised over state-law claims.
2. Plaintiff was required to file a written response by July 7, 2025 explaining why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act and other state-law claims, including the amount of statutory damages sought and facts relevant to high-frequency-litigant status.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“*‘[I]t is well established that ‘a court may raise the question of subject matter jurisdiction, sua sponte, at any time during the pendency of the action’*”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The complaint alleged a violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act and sought injunctive relief. It also asserted a claim for damages under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act and other state-law claims. The opinion does not resolve the truth of the alleged violation or the merits of any claim.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a complaint asserting an ADA claim for injunctive relief, an Unruh Act claim for damages, and other state-law claims. The court determined that supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a) was the sole asserted basis for jurisdiction over the Unruh Act claim and ordered Plaintiff to respond regarding the propriety of exercising that jurisdiction. The court warned that failure to respond could result in dismissal without prejudice or declining supplemental jurisdiction and dismissing the Unruh Act claim.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Arroyo v. Rosas, 19 F.4th 1202, 1211–14 (9th Cir. 2021)
- Nevada v. Bank of Am. Corp., 672 F.3d 661, 673 (9th Cir. 2012)
- Snell v. Cleveland, Inc., 316 F.3d 822, 826 (9th Cir. 2002)

OPINION

Yuri Doering v. Juan Garcia

PER CURIAM.

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. CV 25-5430-MWF(JCx) Date: June 20, 2025 Title Yuri Doering v. Juan Garcia, et al.
Present: The Honorable: MICHAEL W. FITZGERALD, United States District Judge Rita Sanchez
Not Reported Deputy Clerk Court Reporter / Recorder Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs: Attorneys
Present for Defendants: Not Present Not Present Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS) ORDER TO
SHOW CAUSE RE SUPPLEMENTAL

JURISDICTION

The Complaint filed in this action asserts a claim for injunctive relief arising out of an alleged violation of the Americans With Disabilities Act (“ADA”), 42 U.S.C. §§ 12101-12213, a claim for damages pursuant to the Unruh Civil Rights Act (“Unruh Act”), Cal. Civ. Code §§ 51–53, and other state law claims alleged by Plaintiff. The sole basis for jurisdiction over the Unruh Act claim is supplemental jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a). The Court, however, may decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction for the reasons delineated in § 1367(c). See also *Arroyo v. Rosas*, 19 F.4th 1202, 1211–14 (9th Cir. 2021) (holding district courts may decline supplemental jurisdiction over ADA-based Unruh Act claims because of “very substantial threat to federal-state comity” presented by plaintiffs’ use of federal courts to evade California’s Unruh Act reforms). This Court has a sua sponte obligation to confirm that it has subject matter jurisdiction. *Nevada v. Bank of Am. Corp.*, 672 F.3d 661, 673 (9th Cir. 2012) (“[I]t is well established that ‘a court may raise the question of subject matter jurisdiction, sua sponte, at any time during the pendency of the action’” (quoting *Snell v. Cleveland, Inc.*, 316 F.3d 822, 826 (9th Cir. 2002))). Therefore, to assist this Court in its duty, Plaintiff is ORDERED to SHOW CAUSE in writing as to why this Court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. CV 25-5430-MWF(JCx) Date: June 20, 2025 Title Yuri Doering v. Juan Garcia, et al.
over the Unruh Act claim and the other state law claims alleged by Plaintiff. The Response to the Order to Show Cause shall include (1) the amount of statutory damages sought pursuant to the Unruh Act; and (2) sufficient facts for the Court to determine whether Plaintiff or Plaintiff’s counsel meet the definition of a “high- frequency litigant” as defined in California Code of Civil Procedure section 425.55(b)(1) & (2). These facts shall be set forth in declarations signed under penalty of perjury. The Response shall be filed on or before JULY 7, 2025. 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’s declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act claim and the dismissal of that claim pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c). IT IS SO ORDERED.