

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

K. Phillip Taylor v. William M. Westenberber, et al.

No. EDCV 25-1847-MWF(ASx) (C.D. Cal. July 30, 2025) · No. EDCV 25-1847-MWF(ASx) · Decided July 30, 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 other state laws. The order requires information concerning statutory damages and whether the plaintiff or counsel qualifies as a high-frequency litigant, and warns that failure to respond may result in dismissal.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Michael W. Fitzgerald
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	July 30, 2025
DOCKET	EDCV 25-1847-MWF(ASx)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court sua sponte issued an order to show cause concerning whether it should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the plaintiff's Unruh Civil Rights Act and other state-law claims.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court independently confirms subject-matter jurisdiction and may raise jurisdictional issues sua sponte at any time during the action.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district-court order; precedential status not stated.
PARTIES	K. Phillip Taylor v. William M. Westenberber, et al.

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Civil Rights Act claim and the other state-law claims.
2. What information plaintiff must provide to show cause why supplemental jurisdiction should be exercised, including the amount of Unruh Act statutory damages sought and facts concerning whether plaintiff or plaintiff's counsel are high-frequency litigants.

HOLDINGS

1. The court may raise the issue of subject-matter jurisdiction sua sponte during the pendency of the action and may require plaintiff to show cause why supplemental jurisdiction should be exercised.
2. Plaintiff was ordered to submit a written response 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 the high-frequency-litigant definition.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“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, for which the asserted jurisdictional basis was supplemental jurisdiction.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a complaint asserting an ADA claim for injunctive relief, an Unruh Civil Rights Act claim for damages, and other state-law claims. The court ordered plaintiff to show cause why supplemental jurisdiction should be exercised and warned that failure to respond could result in dismissal without prejudice or declination of supplemental jurisdiction.

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)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-central-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-for/2025/k-philip-taylor-v-william-m-westenberber-et-al-cuszvcm0>