

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Dennis Cooper v. Mula Terca Investments, LLC

Cooper v. Mula Terca Investments, LLC · No. 5:25-cv-01369-DTB · Decided July 29, 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 state-law claims under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act. The court also required disclosures concerning the specific statutory damages sought and whether the plaintiff and counsel meet California's definition of high-frequency litigant, warning that noncompliance could result in dismissal.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	David T. Bristow, Magistrate Judge
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	July 29, 2025
DOCKET	5:25-cv-01369-DTB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court issued an order to show cause regarding whether it should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the plaintiff's California Unruh Civil Rights Act claims.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential interlocutory district court order

TOPICS

subject matter jurisdictioncivil procedureada / disability

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedureSupplemental jurisdictionAmericans with Disabilities ActCalifornia civil rights law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the plaintiff's Unruh Civil Rights Act claims.

2. Whether plaintiff and plaintiff's counsel must provide information sufficient for the court to determine whether plaintiff satisfies California's definition of a high-frequency litigant.

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.’”” (unpaginated)

“Plaintiff is, therefore, ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE in writing why the Court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims asserted in the Complaint.” (unpaginated)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The complaint alleges a violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act and seeks injunctive relief. It also seeks damages under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act. The order does not resolve the merits of either claim and does not provide additional underlying factual findings.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a complaint asserting a claim for injunctive relief under the Americans with Disabilities Act and a damages claim under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act. The court determined that it appeared to possess only supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claims and ordered plaintiff to explain why that jurisdiction should be exercised. The court also required plaintiff and counsel to submit declarations concerning whether plaintiff qualifies as a high-frequency litigant.

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL
MINUTES--GENERAL Case No. 5:25-cv-01369-DTB Date: July 29, 2025 Title: Dennis Cooper
v. Mula Terca Investments, LLC, et al

===== DOCKET
ENTRY =====

PRESENT: HON. DAVID T. BRISTOW, MAGISTRATE JUDGE Rachel Maurice n/a Deputy
Clerk Court Reporter ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR PLAINTIFF: ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR
DEFENDANT(S): None present None present PROCEEDINGS: (IN CHAMBERS) ORDER TO
SHOW CAUSE REGARDING SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION 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”), and a claim for damages pursuant to California's Unruh Civil Rights Act (“Unruh Act”).

It appears the Court possesses only supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claim(s) asserted in the Complaint. 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 (1997) (emphasis added) (quoting *Carnegie-Mellon Univ. v. Cohill*, 484 U.S. 343, 350 (1988)).

Plaintiff is, therefore, ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE in writing why the Court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims asserted in the Complaint. See 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c). Plaintiff’s response shall be filed no later than seven days from the date of this Order.

In the response, Plaintiff shall identify the specific amount of statutory damages Plaintiff seeks to recover. Plaintiff and Plaintiff’s counsel shall also file declarations, signed under penalty of perjury, providing all facts necessary for the Court to determine if they satisfy the definition of “high-frequency litigant” as provided by Sections 425.55(b)(1) and (2) of the California Code of Civil Procedure.

Plaintiff is expressly warned failure to timely or adequately respond to this Order to Show Cause may, without further warning, result in this action being dismissed without prejudice for failure to prosecute and comply with court orders, see FED. R. CIV. P. 41(b), or the Court declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state law claims and the dismissal of such claims, see 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c).

IT IS SO ORDERED.