

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Lamar Myers v. Ruben Vallejo-Gutierrez, et al.

Myers v. Vallejo-Gutierrez · No. CV 25-8942 PA (BFMx) · Decided October 1, 2025

SUMMARY

The Central District of California orders the plaintiff to show cause why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over claims under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act and any other state-law claims. The order also requires disclosures concerning the statutory damages sought and declarations addressing whether the plaintiff and counsel qualify as high-frequency litigants under California law, with a response due by October 15, 2025.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Percy Anderson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	October 1, 2025
DOCKET	CV 25-8942 PA (BFMx)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court issued a sua sponte order to show cause requiring plaintiff to explain why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the California Unruh Civil Rights Act claim and any other state-law claims.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court exercises discretion under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c), considering judicial economy, convenience, fairness, and comity.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential district court order
PARTIES	Lamar Myers v. Ruben Vallejo-Gutierrez, et al.

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiff should be required to show cause why the district court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Civil Rights Act claim and any other state-law claims.
2. What information plaintiff and counsel must provide to permit the court to evaluate supplemental jurisdiction and whether they satisfy California's definition of high-frequency litigants.

HOLDINGS

1. The court ordered plaintiff to show cause in writing why it should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act claim and any other state-law claims, and required a timely response by October 15, 2025.
2. Plaintiff must identify the amount of statutory damages sought, and plaintiff and plaintiff's counsel must submit declarations under penalty of perjury addressing facts relevant to California's high-frequency-litigant definition.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“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.’” (522 U.S. at 173)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The complaint alleged a violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act and sought injunctive relief. It also asserted a California Unruh Civil Rights Act claim seeking damages and possibly other state-law relief.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a complaint asserting an Americans with Disabilities Act claim for injunctive relief and an Unruh Civil Rights Act claim for damages. Before further proceedings, the district court ordered plaintiff to respond regarding supplemental jurisdiction, identify the statutory damages sought, and submit declarations addressing whether plaintiff and counsel qualify as high-frequency litigants.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- City of Chicago v. International College of Surgeons, 522 U.S. 156, 173 (1997)
- Carnegie-Mellon University v. Cohill, 484 U.S. 343, 350 (1988)

OPINION

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL Case No. CV 25-8942 PA (BFMx) Date October 1, 2025 Title Lamar Myers v. Ruben Vallejo-Gutierrez, et al. Present: The Honorable PERCY ANDERSON, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE Kamilla Sali-Suleyman Not Reported Deputy Clerk Court Reporter / Recorder Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs: Attorneys Present for Defendants: None None Proceedings: IN CHAMBERS — ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE 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”), 42 U.S.C. §§ 12010-12213, and a claim for damages pursuant to California’s Unruh Civil Rights Act (“Unruh Act”), Cal. Civ.

Code §§ 51-53. 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, 118 S. Ct.

523, 534, 139 L. Ed. 2d 525 (1997) (emphasis added) (quoting *Carnegie-Mellon Univ. v. Cohill*, 484 U.S. 343, 350, 108 S. Ct. 614, 619, 98 L. Ed. 2d 720 (1988)). The Court therefore 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, plaintiff shall identify the amount of statutory damages plaintiff seeks to recover. Plaintiff and plaintiff’s counsel shall also support their responses to the Order to Show Cause 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) & (2).

Plaintiff shall file a Response to this Order to Show Cause by no later than October 15, 2025. 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 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).