

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Miriam Maldonado v. Cal Tile Center, Inc. et al.

Maldonado v. Cal Tile Center · No. CV 25-06778 PA (SKx) · Decided August 4, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for 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 court also requires information about the statutory damages sought and declarations addressing whether the plaintiff and counsel meet California's definition of high-frequency litigants. A response is due by August 18, 2025, with failure to respond potentially resulting in dismissal.

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	August 4, 2025
DOCKET	CV 25-06778 PA (SKx)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court issued an in-chambers order to show cause shortly after the filing of the complaint, directing plaintiff to explain why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Civil Rights Act claim and any other state-law claims.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court considered whether to exercise supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c), weighing judicial economy, convenience, fairness, and comity.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished, nonprecedential district court order
PARTIES	Miriam Maldonado v. Cal Tile Center, Inc. et al.

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

Americans with Disabilities Act

supplemental jurisdiction

California Unruh Civil Rights Act

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiff should be required to show cause why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Civil Rights Act claim and any other state-law claims.
2. What information plaintiff must provide to enable the court to evaluate supplemental jurisdiction and the applicability of California's high-frequency-litigant provisions.

HOLDINGS

1. Because it appeared that the court possessed only supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Civil Rights Act claim and any other state-law claims, the court ordered plaintiff to show cause in writing why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over those claims.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"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 complaint alleged a violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act and sought injunctive relief. It also sought damages under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act and possibly asserted other state-law claims. The court required information about the amount of statutory damages sought and facts concerning whether plaintiff and counsel qualified as high-frequency litigants under California law.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The complaint asserted a claim for injunctive relief under the Americans with Disabilities Act and a claim for damages under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act. The court determined that it appeared to possess only supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act and other state-law claims, and ordered plaintiff to respond in writing by August 18, 2025. The order warned that failure to respond could result in dismissal without prejudice or declining supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claims.

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 25-06778 PA (SKx) Date August 4, 2025 Title Miriam Maldonado v. Cal Tile Center, Inc. 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 August 18, 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).