

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Darwin Boggs v. New Era Flowers Wholesale Corp. et al.

Boggs v. New Era Flowers Wholesale Corp. · No. 5:25-cv-01810-SSS-SSCx · Decided July 24, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California ordered the plaintiff to show cause why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over claims under California’s Unruh Civil Rights Act and related state law. The court also required declarations addressing whether the plaintiff and counsel qualify as high-frequency litigants, identified a deadline for the response, and set a hearing.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sunshine S. Sykes
DECIDED	July 24, 2025
DOCKET	5:25-cv-01810-SSS-SSCx
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court issued an order to show cause requiring the plaintiff to explain why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over claims under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act and related state-law claims.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; nonprecedential

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- supplemental jurisdiction
- Americans with Disabilities Act
- California civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the plaintiff should be required to show cause why the federal court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Civil Rights Act claim and related state-law claims.

2. What information the plaintiff and counsel must provide to permit the court to evaluate supplemental jurisdiction and the possible application of California's high-frequency-litigant provisions.

HOLDINGS

1. Because the court possessed only supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Civil Rights Act claim and related state claims, it required the plaintiff to show cause why the court should exercise that jurisdiction and advised that it could decline supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c).

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The supplemental jurisdiction statute “reflects the understanding that, when deciding whether to exercise supplemental jurisdiction, ‘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.’””

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The complaint alleged a violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act and sought injunctive relief. It also sought damages under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act and asserted related state claims. The court noted that it possessed only supplemental jurisdiction over those state-law claims and required information concerning the amount of statutory damages and the plaintiff's and counsel's high-frequency-litigant status.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The complaint asserted an Americans with Disabilities Act claim for injunctive relief, an Unruh Civil Rights Act damages claim, and related state claims. The court determined that its jurisdiction over the state-law claims was supplemental and ordered the plaintiff and counsel to provide written responses and sworn declarations addressing supplemental jurisdiction, claimed statutory damages, and whether they met California's definition of a high-frequency litigant.

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)