

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF  
CALIFORNIA

Colton Bryant v. Monkish Brewing Co. LLC et al.

Bryant v. Monkish Brewing Co. · No. 2:25-cv-10489-SVW-SSC · Decided November 4, 2025

SUMMARY

The Central District of California ordered the parties to file a joint status report addressing alleged ADA barriers, any remedial measures, and potential summary judgment motions. The court also ordered the plaintiff to show cause why it should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act and other state-law claims and to provide information concerning requested statutory damages and high-frequency litigant status. The plaintiff was directed to respond within 14 days, with failure to respond potentially resulting in dismissal.

CASE DETAILS

|                       |                                                                                                                                               |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| COURT                 | United States District Court for the Central District of California                                                                           |
| WRITING FOR THE COURT | Stephen V. Wilson                                                                                                                             |
| DECIDED               | November 4, 2025                                                                                                                              |
| DOCKET                | 2:25-cv-10489-SVW-SSC                                                                                                                         |
| DISPOSITION           | other                                                                                                                                         |
| PROCEDURAL POSTURE    | Order to show cause and order for joint status report in an ADA action involving alleged architectural barriers and related state-law claims. |
| PRECEDENTIAL VALUE    | nonprecedential order                                                                                                                         |
| PARTIES               | Colton Bryant v. Monkish Brewing Co. LLC et al.                                                                                               |

TOPICS

- ada / disability
- public accommodations discrimination
- civil procedure
- summary judgment
- attorney fees

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil procedure
- Americans with Disabilities Act
- Civil rights
- Remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the court should require the parties to report on investigation or remediation of 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 the plaintiff and counsel must provide declarations addressing the California high-frequency-litigant definition and the amount of statutory damages sought.

## HOLDINGS

1. When a defendant removes alleged ADA barriers and demonstrates that the barriers could not reasonably be expected to arise again, the ADA claim may be rendered moot and dismissed.
2. Nominal damages are not available under Title III of the ADA; therefore, pleading nominal damages does not prevent mootness caused by remediation.
3. If the ADA claims are mooted and dismissed, the court has discretion to decline supplemental jurisdiction over related state-law claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c).
4. When an ADA claim is mooted and dismissed before trial, the plaintiff is not entitled to attorney's fees under the circumstances described in the order.

## KEY QUOTATIONS

*“a defendant’s voluntary removal of alleged barriers prior to trial can have the effect of mootting a plaintiff’s ADA claim.”* (at 1)

*“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 2)

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The complaint asserts claims under Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act based on alleged barriers and invokes supplemental jurisdiction over state-law claims, including an Unruh Act claim. The order does not identify the alleged barriers or describe any completed remediation; instead, it directs the defendant to report measures taken to investigate or remedy them. The court also required information concerning the amount of statutory damages sought and whether the plaintiff and counsel meet California's definition of high-frequency litigant.

## PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action was pending in the Central District of California before the initial status conference. The court ordered the parties to submit a joint status report addressing any remedial measures, the parties' positions concerning those measures, and whether and when they intend to seek summary judgment. The court also ordered the plaintiff to show cause why it should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act and other state-law claims and warned that failure to respond could result in dismissal without prejudice.

## DISPOSITION

other

## CASES CITED

- Oliver v. Ralphs Grocery Co., 654 F.3d 903, 905 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Am. Cargo Transp., 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 Sch., 931 F.3d 1, 11 (1st Cir. 2019)
- Brooke v. A-Ventures, LLC, 2017 WL 5624941, at \*5 (D. Ariz. Nov. 22, 2017)
- Oliver v. Ralphs Grocery Co., 654 F.3d 903, 911 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Buckhannon Bd. & Care Home, Inc. v. W. Va. Dep't of Health & Hum. Res., 532 U.S. 598 (2001)
- Molski v. Foster Freeze Paso Robles, 267 F. App'x 631, 632 (9th Cir. 2008)
- City of Chicago v. Int'l Coll. of Surgeons, 522 U.S. 156, 173 (1997)
- Carnegie-Mellon Univ. v. Cohill, 484 U.S. 343, 350 (1988)

---

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-central-district-of-california/2025/colton-bryant-v-monkish-brewing-co-llc-et-al-8c7l95gp>