

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Julio Cruz v. Thai Brothers et al.

Cruz v. Thai Brothers · No. 8:25-cv-02590-MRA-KES · Decided December 23, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California ordered Plaintiff Julio Cruz to show cause why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over his California state-law claims arising from alleged disability-access violations. The court discussed 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c), California pleading and filing requirements for construction-related accessibility claims, and decisions involving high-frequency litigants. Plaintiff was directed to identify the statutory damages sought and submit declarations addressing whether Plaintiff and counsel meet California’s high-frequency-litigant definitions.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Monica Ramirez Almadant
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	December 23, 2025
DOCKET	8:25-cv-02590-MRA-KES
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court issued an order to show cause requiring plaintiff to explain why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over state-law claims accompanying an Americans with Disabilities Act claim.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Discretionary review under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c), informed by the values of judicial economy, convenience, fairness, and comity.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Julio Cruz v. Thai Brothers, South Coast Highway LLC, Does 1-10

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- civil procedure
- ada / disability
- federalism

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

disability rights

federal jurisdiction

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over plaintiff's Unruh Act and related California state-law claims.
2. Whether plaintiff and plaintiff's counsel qualify as high-frequency litigants under California law, such that fairness and comity may counsel against supplemental jurisdiction.

HOLDINGS

1. The court deferred deciding whether to exercise supplemental jurisdiction and ordered plaintiff to show cause why supplemental jurisdiction should be exercised over the Unruh Act and related state-law claims.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"The supplemental jurisdiction statute enumerates the following situations in which a district court can decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction:" (at 1)

"The statute thereby 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 litigation, the values of judicial economy, convenience, fairness, and comity.'" (at 1)

"Failure to timely or adequately respond to this Order to Show Cause may, without further warning, result in the Court declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's Unruh Act and related state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c)." (at 4)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Julio Cruz sued Thai Brothers, South Coast Highway LLC, and Doe defendants, asserting an ADA claim for injunctive relief and related California claims seeking damages and, for some claims, injunctive relief. The state-law claims included claims under the Unruh Civil Rights Act, the California Disabled Persons Act, California Health and Safety Code § 19955 et seq., and negligence. The court identified California's heightened pleading and fee requirements for construction-related accessibility claims and high-frequency litigants, and sought information necessary to determine whether those circumstances applied to Cruz and his counsel.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed the action on November 18, 2025, asserting an ADA claim and related claims under California law. The court had not yet ruled on whether to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claims and ordered plaintiff to respond within 14 days with information concerning statutory damages and whether plaintiff and counsel qualify as high-frequency litigants under California law.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- City of Chicago v. International College of Surgeons, 522 U.S. 156, 172-73 (1997)
- United Mine Workers of America v. Gibbs, 383 U.S. 715, 726 (1966)
- Carnegie-Mellon University v. Cohill, 484 U.S. 343, 350 (1988)
- Arroyo v. Rosas, 19 F.4th 1202, 1207, 1211-12 (9th Cir. 2021)
- Whitaker v. Mac, 411 F. Supp. 3d 1108, 1116 (C.D. Cal. 2019)
- Schutza v. Cuddeback, 262 F. Supp. 3d 1025, 1031 (S.D. Cal. 2017)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-central-district-of-cal/2025/julio-cruz-v-thai-brothers-et-al-jvsiqcm0>