

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA**

Dennis Cooper v. Hesperia 2001, LLC et al.

Cooper · No. EDCV 23-413 JGB (KKx; 5:23-cv-00413-JGB-KK) · Decided March 13, 2023

OPINION

Dennis Cooper v. Hesperia 2011, LLC

PER CURIAM.

Case 5:23-cv-00413-JGB-KK Document 9 Filed 03/13/23 Page 1 of 2 Page ID #:25

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No. EDCV 23-413 JGB (KKx) Date March 13, 2023 Title Dennis Cooper v. Hesperia 2001, LLC et al. Present: The Honorable JESUS G. BERNAL, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE MAYNOR GALVEZ Not Reported Deputy Clerk Court Reporter Attorney(s) Present for Plaintiff(s): Attorney(s) Present for Defendant(s): None Present None Present Proceedings: Order to Show Cause (IN CHAMBERS) The complaint filed in this action asserts a claim for injunctive relief arising out of an alleged violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”) and a claim for damages pursuant to California’s Unruh Civil Rights Act (“Unruh Act”), among other state-law claims. (See “Complaint,” Dkt. No. 1.) It appears that the Court possesses only supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act claim, and any other state-law claim that Plaintiff may have alleged, pursuant to the Court’s supplemental jurisdiction. 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) (quoting *Carnegie-Mellon Univ. v. Cohill*, 484 U.S. 343, 350 (1988)). Therefore, the Court orders Plaintiff to show cause in writing why the Court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act claim and any other state-law claim asserted in the complaint. See 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c). In responding to this Order to Show Cause (“OSC”), Plaintiff shall identify the amount of statutory damages that Plaintiff seeks to recover. Plaintiff and Plaintiff’s counsel shall also support their responses to the OSC with declarations, signed under penalty of perjury, providing all facts necessary for the Court to determine if they satisfy the definition of a “high-frequency litigant” as provided by California Civil Procedure Code Sections 425.55(b)(1)-(b)(2). Plaintiff shall file a Response to this OSC no later than Wednesday, March 22, 2023. Page 1 of 2 CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL Initials of Deputy Clerk mg Case 5:23-cv-00413-JGB-KK Document 9 Filed 03/13/23 Page 2 of 2 Page ID

#:26 Failure to timely or adequately respond to this OSC 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 and other state-law claims, if any, and the dismissal of any such claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c). IT IS SO ORDERED. Page 2 of 2 CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL Initials of Deputy Clerk mg