

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Yeong Lee v. Pantox, LLC

Yeong Lee · No. 8:25-cv-01150-FLA-BFM · Decided June 2, 2025

SUMMARY

The Central District of California ordered Plaintiff Yeong Lee to show cause why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over claims under California’s Unruh Civil Rights Act. The order discusses discretionary jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1367, California’s heightened pleading requirements for construction-related accessibility claims, and the treatment of high-frequency litigants. Plaintiff was directed to identify the statutory damages sought and submit declarations addressing whether Plaintiff and counsel meet the statutory definition of high-frequency litigants.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Fernando L. Aenlle-Rocha
JURISDICTION	U.S. District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	June 2, 2025
DOCKET	8:25-cv-01150-FLA-BFM
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court issued an order to show cause directing Plaintiff to explain why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over claims under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act and related state-law claims.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Supplemental jurisdiction is discretionary under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c); the court must consider the circumstances of the case, the nature of the state-law claims, the governing state law, the relationship between the federal and state claims, and the values of judicial economy, convenience, fairness, and comity.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's Unruh Act claim and any related state-law claims.
2. What information Plaintiff must provide concerning the amount of statutory damages sought and whether Plaintiff and counsel qualify as high-frequency litigants under California law.

HOLDINGS

1. The court did not yet decide whether to exercise supplemental jurisdiction; instead, it ordered Plaintiff to show cause why supplemental jurisdiction should be exercised and warned that failure to respond may result in dismissal of the state-law claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c).

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The United States Supreme Court has recognized supplemental jurisdiction “is a doctrine of discretion, not of plaintiff’s right, and that district courts can decline to exercise jurisdiction over pendent claims for a number of valid reasons.””

“In light of the foregoing, the court ORDERS Plaintiff to show cause in writing why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act claim and any related state law claims.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The complaint alleges a violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act and seeks injunctive relief. It also asserts a claim for damages under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act based on alleged disability-access violations. The court identified California's heightened pleading requirements and high-frequency-litigant provisions for construction-related accessibility claims as relevant to whether supplemental jurisdiction should be exercised.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a complaint asserting an ADA claim for injunctive relief and an Unruh Act claim for damages, requesting supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claim. Before ruling on supplemental jurisdiction, the district court ordered Plaintiff to respond in writing and provide declarations addressing whether Plaintiff and counsel satisfy California's high-frequency-litigant requirements.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- City of Chi. v. Int'l Coll. of Surgeons, 522 U.S. 156, 172-73 (1997)
- Carnegie-Mellon Univ. v. Cohill, 484 U.S. 343, 350 (1988)

- *Acri v. Varian Assocs.*, 114 F.3d 999, 1000 (9th Cir. 1997)
- *Schutz v. Cuddeback*, 262 F. Supp. 3d 1025, 1031 (S.D. Cal. 2017)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/u-s-district-court-for-the-central-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-for-the-centr/2025/yeong-lee-v-pantox-llc-h07vmmm6>