

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Nelson Chilin v. Royal Capital LLC

No. 5:25-cv-02031-RGK-SP, United States District Court for the Central District of California (September 30, 2025)

SUMMARY

The Central District of California issued an order to show cause concerning the court’s exercise of supplemental jurisdiction over claims under California’s Unruh Civil Rights Act and other state law. The court directed the plaintiff to identify the statutory damages sought and provide declarations addressing whether the plaintiff and counsel qualify as high-frequency litigants under California law, with a response due October 7, 2025.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Gary Klausner
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	September 30, 2025
DOCKET	5:25-cv-02031-RGK-SP
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court issued an in-chambers order to show cause directing plaintiff to explain why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Civil Rights Act claim and other state-law claims.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- disability rights
- supplemental jurisdiction

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiff should be required to show cause why the district court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Civil Rights Act claim and other state-law claims.
2. What information plaintiff and plaintiff's counsel must provide concerning the amount of statutory damages sought and potential high-frequency-litigant status.

HOLDINGS

1. Because the complaint appeared to provide the court with only supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Civil Rights Act and other state-law claims, the court ordered plaintiff to show cause in writing why it should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over those claims.

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 alleges a violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act and seeks injunctive relief. It also asserts a claim for damages under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act and other state-law claims. The court required plaintiff and plaintiff's counsel to provide declarations addressing whether they satisfy California's definition of a high-frequency litigant.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a complaint asserting an Americans with Disabilities Act claim for injunctive relief, an Unruh Civil Rights Act claim for damages, and other state-law claims. The court issued an order to show cause because it appeared to possess only supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claims and required a written response, including information concerning statutory damages and 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

Nelson Chilin v. Royal Capital LLC

PER CURIAM.

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No. 5:25-cv-02031-RGK-SP Date September 30, 2025 Title NELSON CHILIN v. ROYAL CAPITAL LLC Present: The Honorable GARY KLAUSNER, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 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, and other state claims. It appears that the Court possesses only supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act claim, and other state law claim that plaintiff has 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 October 7, 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).