

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Michael Harrison v. Liberty Laundry

No. 8:25-cv-00360-SVW-JDE, United States District Court for the Central District of California (February 27, 2025)

SUMMARY

The Central District of California ordered the parties to submit a joint status report addressing any remediation of alleged ADA barriers and their intended summary-judgment motions. The court also ordered the plaintiff to show cause why it should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act and other state-law claims, identify the statutory damages sought, and provide declarations concerning high-frequency litigant status.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Stephen V. Wilson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court, Central District of California
DECIDED	February 27, 2025
DOCKET	8:25-cv-00360-SVW-JDE
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court issued an order to show cause and ordered the parties to submit a joint status report in a pending action alleging violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act and related state-law claims.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- Americans with Disabilities Act
- supplemental jurisdiction
- accessibility discrimination
- attorney's fees

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the parties should be required to report on investigation or remediation of the alleged ADA barriers and their anticipated summary-judgment motions.
2. Whether the plaintiff should show cause why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act and other state-law claims.
3. Whether failure to respond adequately could support dismissal of the action without prejudice or dismissal of state-law claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c).

KEY QUOTATIONS

“It is the policy of this Court to encourage expedient resolution of civil litigation.”

“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.’”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The plaintiff alleged accessibility barriers supporting claims under the ADA and California state law, including the Unruh Civil Rights Act. The order indicates that the defendant might have investigated or remedied the alleged barriers. The court also required information concerning the amount of statutory damages sought and whether the plaintiff and counsel qualified as high-frequency litigants under California law.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action was pending before the Central District of California. The court directed the parties to report on any remediation of alleged ADA barriers and their anticipated summary-judgment motions. The court also ordered the plaintiff to show cause why supplemental jurisdiction should be exercised over the Unruh Act and any other state-law claims, and warned that failure to respond could result in dismissal without prejudice.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Oliver v. Ralphs Grocery Co., 654 F.3d 903, 905 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Am. Cargo Transp., Inc. v. United States, 625 F.3d 1176, 1179 (9th Cir. 2010)
- Hillesheim v. Holiday Stationstores, Inc., 953 F.3d 1059, 1062 (8th Cir. 2020)
- G. v. Fay Sch., 931 F.3d 1, 11 (1st Cir. 2019)
- Brooke v. A-Ventures, LLC, 2017 WL 5624941, at *5 (D. Ariz. Nov. 22, 2017)
- Oliver v. Ralphs Grocery Co., 654 F.3d 903, 911 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Buckhannon Bd. & Care Home, Inc. v. W. Va. Dept. of Health & Human Resources, 532 U.S. 598 (2001)
- Molski v. Foster Freeze Paso Robles, 267 Fed. Appx. 631, 632 (9th Cir. 2008)

- City of Chicago v. Int'l Coll. of Surgeons, 522 U.S. 156, 173 (1997)
- Carnegie-Mellon Univ. v. Cohill, 484 U.S. 343, 350 (1988)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-central-district-of-cal/2025/michael-harrison-v-liberty-laundry-ie7wa8c0>