

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Nelson Chilin v. 1 Stop Hardware, Inc. et al.

Chilin v. 1 Stop Hardware · No. 5:25-cv-00478-FLA-SHK · Decided February 25, 2025

SUMMARY

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 related state law claims. The order directs the plaintiff and counsel to submit responses and declarations addressing statutory damages and 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	Fernando L. Aenlle-Rocha
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	February 25, 2025
DOCKET	5:25-cv-00478-FLA-SHK
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court issued an order to show cause requiring Plaintiff to explain why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over his Unruh Civil Rights Act claim and related state-law claims.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Whether to exercise supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1367 is discretionary and requires consideration of the circumstances of the case, the nature of the state-law claims, the governing state law, the relationship between the federal and state claims, and the values of judicial economy, convenience, fairness, and comity.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; interlocutory district-court order
PARTIES	Nelson Chilin v. 1 Stop Hardware, Inc. et al.

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's Unruh Civil Rights Act claim and any related state-law claims.
2. What information Plaintiff and counsel must provide for the court to evaluate the discretionary exercise of supplemental jurisdiction, including the amount of statutory damages sought and whether Plaintiff qualifies as a high-frequency litigant.

HOLDINGS

1. Supplemental jurisdiction is discretionary rather than a right of the plaintiff; even when § 1367(a) encompasses a state-law claim, a district court may decline jurisdiction under § 1367(c), including when exceptional circumstances or other compelling reasons exist.
2. California's heightened pleading requirements and high-frequency-litigant fee provisions are relevant to the fairness and comity analysis when deciding whether to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over construction-related Unruh Act claims.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The United States Supreme Court has recognized supplemental jurisdiction “is a doctrine of discretion, not of plaintiff’s right, and that district courts can decline to exercise jurisdiction over pendent claims for a number of valid reasons.””

“In light of the foregoing, the court ORDERS Plaintiff to show cause in writing why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act claim and any related state law claims.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The complaint alleges a violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act and seeks injunctive relief. It also asserts a damages claim under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act and asks the federal court to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over that claim. The court noted California's heightened pleading requirements and high-frequency-litigant fee provisions for certain construction-related disability-access claims.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a complaint asserting an ADA claim for injunctive relief and a California Unruh Civil Rights Act claim for damages. Plaintiff requested supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claim under 28 U.S.C. § 1367. Before deciding whether to retain the state-law claims, the court ordered Plaintiff and counsel to provide a written response and declarations addressing statutory damages and whether Plaintiff qualifies as a high-frequency litigant.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- City of Chi. v. Int'l Coll. of Surgeons, 522 U.S. 156, 172-73 (1997)
- Carnegie-Mellon Univ. v. Cohill, 484 U.S. 343, 350 (1988)
- Acri v. Varian Assocs., 114 F.3d 999, 1000 (9th Cir. 1997)
- Schutza v. Cuddeback, 262 F. Supp. 3d 1025, 1031 (S.D. Cal. 2017)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-central-district-of-cal/2025/nelson-chilin-v-1-stop-hardware-inc-et-al-phxnshv4>