

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Leemanuel Welch v. Rheetech Sales and Services, Inc.

Weilch v. Rheetech · No. 8:25-cv-01152-RGK-DFM · Decided June 6, 2025

SUMMARY

The Central District of California issued an order to show cause concerning the Court’s potential exercise of supplemental jurisdiction over claims under California’s Unruh Civil Rights Act and any other state-law claims. The order requires the plaintiff to identify the statutory damages sought and requires the plaintiff and counsel to submit declarations addressing whether they qualify as high-frequency litigants under California law.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Gary Klausner
JURISDICTION	U.S. District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	June 6, 2025
DOCKET	8:25-cv-01152-RGK-DFM
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court issued an in-chambers order to show cause after reviewing the complaint's ADA and California Unruh Civil Rights Act claims.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- civil procedure
- injunctions
- ada / disability
- damages

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights
- Americans with Disabilities Act
- supplemental jurisdiction

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the district court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act claim and any other state-law claims under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1367(a) and 1367(c).

2. What additional information plaintiff must provide concerning the amount of statutory damages sought and whether plaintiff qualifies as a California high-frequency litigant.

HOLDINGS

1. The court ordered 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.
2. The court required plaintiff to identify the amount of statutory damages sought and required plaintiff and counsel to submit declarations under penalty of perjury containing facts necessary to determine whether plaintiff satisfies California's high-frequency-litigant definition.

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.’” (at 1)

“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).” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The complaint alleges a violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act and seeks injunctive relief. It also seeks damages under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act, along with any other state-law relief alleged in the complaint.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a complaint asserting an ADA claim for injunctive relief and an Unruh Act claim for damages. Before further proceedings, the district court ordered plaintiff to explain why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act and any other state-law claims and directed plaintiff and counsel to submit declarations concerning high-frequency-litigant status.

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. 8:25-cv-01152-RGK-DFM Date June 6, 2025 Title LEEMANUEL WEILCH v. RHEETECH SALES AND SERVICES, INC., et al Present: The GARY KLAUSNER, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE Honorable Joseph Remigio (not present) 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 June 13, 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).