

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Miriam Maldonado v. The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company, et al.

No. 2:25-cv-10853-JAK (PVCx) · No. No. 2:25-cv-10853-JAK (PVCx) · Decided November 19, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California ordered Plaintiff Miriam Maldonado to show cause why the court should not decline supplemental jurisdiction over her state-law claims, including claims under the Unruh Civil Rights Act. The court cited California requirements applicable to high-frequency litigants and ordered Plaintiff to identify the statutory damages sought and submit a supporting declaration by December 3, 2025; Defendants may respond by December 10, 2025.

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 MIRIAM MALDONADO, No. 2:25-cv-10853-JAK (PVCx) 11 Plaintiff,
ORDER RE TO SHOW CAUSE RE: 12 SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION v. OVER STATE-
LAW CLAIMS 13 THE GOODYEAR TIRE & RUBBER 14 COMPANY, et al., 15 Defendants.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 1 Based on a review of the Complaint (Dkt.

1), the following determinations are 2 made: 3 The Complaint alleges violations of the Americans
with Disabilities Act, 42 4 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq. (the “ADA”), the Unruh Civil Rights Act (the
“Unruh Act”), Cal. 5 Civ. Code §§ 51–52, and other provisions of California law. Supplemental
jurisdiction is 6 the basis for the state-law claims. Dkt. 1 ¶ 7. 7 District courts may exercise
“supplemental jurisdiction over all other claims that 8 are so related to claims in the action within
such original jurisdiction that they form part 9 of the same case or controversy under Article III of
the United States Constitution.” 28 10 U.S.C. § 1367(a).

This “is a doctrine of discretion, not of plaintiff’s right.” *United Mine 11 Workers v. Gibbs*, 383
U.S. 715, 726 (1966). “In order to decide whether to exercise 12 jurisdiction over pendent state
law claims, a district court should consider... at every 13 stage of the litigation, the values of
judicial economy, convenience, fairness, and 14 comity.” *Nishimoto v. Federman-Bachrach &
Assocs.*, 903 F.2d 709, 715 (9th Cir.

1990) 15 (citation omitted). 16 In 2012, California imposed heightened pleading requirements for
Unruh Act 17 claims. Cal. Civ. Code § 55.52(a)(1); Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 425.50(a). In 2015, 18
California also imposed a “high-frequency litigant fee” for plaintiffs and law firms that 19 have
brought large numbers of construction-related accessibility claims.

Cal. Gov't Code 20 70616.5. As detailed in previous orders by this Court and other district courts in 21 California, these reforms addressed the small number of plaintiffs and counsel who bring 22 a significant percentage of construction-related accessibility claims. E.g., *Whitaker v. RCP Belmont Shore LLC*, No. LA CV19-09561 JAK (JEMx), 2020 WL 3800449, at *6– 24 8 (Mar.

30, 2020); *Garibay v. Rodriguez*, No. 2:18-cv-09187-PA (AFMx), 2019 WL 25 5204294, at *1–6 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 27, 2019). These statutes impose special requirements 26 for construction-related accessibility claims brought by high-frequency plaintiffs 27 pursuant to the Unruh Act.

Because accepting supplemental jurisdiction over such claims 1 would permit high-frequency plaintiffs to side-step those state-law requirements by 2 pursuing the claims in a federal forum, many district courts, including this one, have 3 declined to exercise such jurisdiction. E.g., *Whitaker*, 2020 WL 3800449, at *6–8; 4 *Garibay*, 2019 WL 5204294, at *1–6. 5 A review of the docket in this District shows that, in the one-year period preceding 6 the filing of the Complaint, Plaintiff has filed more than ten actions in which she has 7 advanced construction-related accessibility claims.

In a California Superior Court, 8 Plaintiff would be deemed a high-frequency litigant. Therefore, “California’s recent 9 legislative enactments confirm that the state has a substantial interest in this case.” *Perri v. Thrifty Payless*, No. 2:19-CV-07829-CJC (SKx), 2019 WL 7882068, at *2 (C.D. Cal. 11 Oct. 8, 2019). 12 In light of the foregoing, Plaintiff is ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE why the 13 Court should not decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claims.

14 Plaintiff shall file a response to this Order to Show Cause, not to exceed ten pages, on or 15 before December 3, 2025. In responding to this Order to Show Cause, Plaintiff shall 16 identify the amount of statutory damages Plaintiff seeks to recover. Plaintiff shall also 17 present a declaration, signed under penalty of perjury, providing the evidence necessary 18 for the Court to determine if Plaintiff meets the definition of a “high-frequency litigant” 19 as defined in Cal. Code Civ.

Proc. § 425.50(b)(1) & (2). Failure to file a timely response 20 to this Order to Show Cause may result in the dismissal of the state-law claims without 21 prejudice by declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over them, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. § 1367(c). Defendant may also file a response to this Order to Show Cause, not to 23 exceed ten pages, on or before December 10, 2025.

Upon receipt of the response(s), the 24 matter will be taken under submission, and a written order will issue. 25 26 IT IS SO ORDERED. 27 2 | Dated: 11/19/2025 C| 3 John A. Kronstadt 4 United States District Judge 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19

