

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Nelson Chilin v. Tokyo Health Studio

Nelson Chilin · No. ED CV 25-1556 PA (RAOx) · Decided June 26, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California ordered 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 required disclosures concerning the statutory damages sought and declarations addressing whether the plaintiff and counsel qualify as high-frequency litigants under California law, with a response due July 10, 2025.

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	June 26, 2025
DOCKET	ED CV 25-1556 PA (RAOx)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court issued an order to show cause requiring the plaintiff to explain why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Civil Rights Act claim and any other state-law claims.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

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

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

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

2. What amount of statutory damages plaintiff seeks and whether plaintiff and counsel satisfy the statutory definition of high-frequency litigants under California Code of Civil Procedure section 425.55(b)(1) and (2).

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.’””

“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).”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The complaint alleged a violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act and sought injunctive relief. It also asserted a claim for damages under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act. The opinion does not provide additional factual findings concerning the alleged ADA violation or the parties' conduct.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a complaint asserting an ADA claim for injunctive relief and a California Unruh Civil Rights Act claim for damages. The court determined that it appeared to possess only supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claims and ordered plaintiff to respond in writing by July 10, 2025. The court warned that failure to respond adequately 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, 118 S. Ct. 523, 534, 139 L. Ed. 2d 525 (1997)
- Carnegie-Mellon University v. Cohill, 484 U.S. 343, 350, 108 S. Ct. 614, 619, 98 L. Ed. 2d 720 (1988)

OPINION

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL Case No. ED CV 25-1556 PA (RAOx) Date June 26, 2025 Title Nelson Chilin v. Tokyo Health Studio 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 July 10, 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).