

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PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential interlocutory district court order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 jurisdiction
- civil procedure
- ada / disability

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil procedure
- Supplemental jurisdiction
- Americans with Disabilities Act
- California 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)