

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Theresa Brooke v. Svag Realty LLC

Brooke · No. 1:25-cv-01146 JLT CDB · Decided October 1, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopted the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations concerning Theresa Brooke’s claims against Svag Realty LLC. The court declined to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the California Unruh Civil Rights Act claim under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c)(4) and dismissed that claim without prejudice.

OPINION

Brooke

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 THERESA BROOKE, Case No. 1:25-cv-01146 JLT CDB 12 Plaintiff, ORDER
ADOPTING FINDINGS AND

RECOMMENDATIONS AND DECLINING

13 v. SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION OVER

PLAINTIFF’S STATE LAW CLAIM

14 SVAG REALTY LLC,

(Doc. 6) 15 Defendant. 16 17 Theresa Brooke seeks to hold Svag Realty LLC liable for violations of the Americans 18 with Disabilities Act and California’s Unruh Civil Rights Act. (Doc. 1.) Following an order to 19 show cause regarding jurisdiction (Doc. 4), the assigned magistrate judge issued Findings and 20 Recommendations, recommending the Court decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over 21 Plaintiff’s state law claim and dismiss the Unruh Act claim without prejudice pursuant to 28 22 U.S.C. § 1367(c)(4). (Doc. 6.) 23 The Court served the Findings and Recommendations on Plaintiff1 and informed her that 24 any objections must be filed within 14 days of the date of service. (Doc. 6 at 8.) The Court 25 advised her that “failure to file objections within the specified time may result in the waiver of 26 rights on appeal.” (Id., citing Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 838-839 (9th Cir. 2014).) 27 Plaintiff did not file objections, and the time to do so has expired. 1 According to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), this Court performed a de novo review of the case. 2 | Having carefully reviewed the matter, the Court concludes the Findings and Recommendations 3 | are supported by the record and by proper

analysis. Thus, the Court ORDERS: 4 1. The Findings and Recommendations dated September 15, 2025 (Doc. 6) are 5 ADOPTED in full. 6 2. The Court DECLINES to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's claim 7 arising under state law pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c)(4). 8 3. Plaintiff's second cause of action for a violation of the Unruh Act is DISMISSED 9 without prejudice. 10 IT IS SO ORDERED. 12 Dated: _ October 1, 2025 Cerin | Tower
TED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28