

**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-SSC · Decided July 24, 2025

OPINION

Darwin Boggs v. New Era Flowers Wholesale Corp.

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES—

GENERAL

Case No. 5:25-cv-01810-SSS-SSC Date July 24, 2025 Title Darwin Boggs v. New Era Flowers Wholesale Corp. et al Present: The Honorable SUNSHINE S. SYKES, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE Irene Vazquez Not Reported Deputy Clerk Court Reporter Attorney(s) Present for Plaintiff(s): Attorney(s) Present for Defendant(s): None Present None Present Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE The Complaint filed in this action asserts a claim for injunctive relief based on an alleged violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”), 42 U.S.C. § 12101, a claim for damages pursuant to California’s Unruh Civil Rights Act (“Unruh Act”), Cal. Civ. Code § 51 et seq, and related state claims. The Court possesses only supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act claim and related state claims. See 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a). 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.’” *City of Chicago v. Int’l Coll. of Surgeons*, 522 U.S. 156, 173 (1997) (emphasis added) (quoting *Carnegie-Mellon Univ. v. Cohill*, 484 U.S. 343, 350 (1988)). The Court therefore orders Plaintiff to show cause in writing why the Court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act claim and related state claims. See 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c). Plaintiff shall identify the amount of statutory damages sought. Plaintiff and plaintiff’s counsel shall also support their responses to this Order with declarations, signed under penalty of perjury, providing all facts necessary for the Court to

CIVIL MINUTES—

determine if they satisfy the definition of a “high-frequency litigant” as provided by California Civil Procedure Code sections 425.55(b)(1) & (2). Plaintiff shall file a Response to this Order to Show Cause by no later than August 1, 2025. The Court sets a hearing date regarding this Order to Show Cause on August 8, 2025, at 1:00 PM via zoom.¹ Plaintiff’s failure to timely or adequately

respond to this Order may, without further warning, result in the dismissal of the entire action without prejudice or the Court declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act claim and related state claims and dismissing the claim pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c). IT IS SO ORDERED. 1 The Court refers the parties to Judge Sykes' website for details regarding hearings via zoom: <https://www.cacd.uscourts.gov/honorable-sunshine-s-sykes>.

CIVIL MINUTES—