

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Ana Ventura v. Xiuzhen Zhang, et al.

Ana Ventura v. Xiuzhen Zhang, No. CV 25-8841-MWF (ASx) (C.D. Cal. Oct. 6, 2025) · No. CV 25-8841-MWF(ASx · Decided October 6, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California ordered Plaintiff Ana Ventura to show cause why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over claims under California’s Unruh Civil Rights Act and other state laws. The order requires information concerning the statutory damages sought and whether Plaintiff or counsel qualifies as a high-frequency litigant, with a response due October 20, 2025.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Michael W. Fitzgerald
DECIDED	October 6, 2025
DOCKET	CV 25-8841-MWF(ASx
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court sua sponte ordered Plaintiff to show cause why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over her Unruh Civil Rights Act claim and other state-law claims.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court has an ongoing obligation to confirm subject-matter jurisdiction and may raise the issue sua sponte at any time during the action.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district-court order; nonprecedential

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- civil procedure
- ada / disability
- civil rights
- damages

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil procedure
- Civil rights
- Disability discrimination
- Federal courts

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Civil Rights Act claim and the other state-law claims.
2. Whether Plaintiff should be required to provide information concerning the amount of Unruh Act statutory damages sought and high-frequency-litigant status before the court determines whether to exercise supplemental jurisdiction.

HOLDINGS

1. A federal court may raise and examine the question of subject-matter jurisdiction sua sponte at any time during the pendency of an action.
2. The court required Plaintiff to show cause in writing why it should exercise supplemental jurisdiction; it did not yet determine whether supplemental jurisdiction would be exercised.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“This Court has a sua sponte obligation to confirm that it has subject matter jurisdiction.” (at 1)

“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).” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The complaint alleges an ADA violation supporting a claim for injunctive relief, as well as an Unruh Civil Rights Act claim for damages and other state-law claims. The Unruh Act claim was asserted in federal court on the basis of supplemental jurisdiction. The court required information concerning the statutory damages sought and whether Plaintiff or her counsel qualifies as a high-frequency litigant under California law.

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 issued an order to show cause requiring Plaintiff to submit a written response addressing supplemental jurisdiction, the amount of Unruh Act damages sought, and facts concerning high-frequency-litigant status.

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)

