

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.

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.