

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Lamar Myers v. Tex Motorwerkes LLC

Myers v. Tex Motorwerkes LLC · No. 2:25-cv-08167-WLH-AJR · Decided September 19, 2025

SUMMARY

The court orders the plaintiff to show cause why it should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over claims under California’s Unruh Civil Rights Act and related state law. The order discusses 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c), California’s restrictions on disability-access litigation, and decisions declining supplemental jurisdiction over similar claims. The plaintiff must identify the statutory damages sought and provide declarations addressing whether the plaintiff and counsel qualify as high-frequency litigants.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	September 19, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-08167-WLH-AJR
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court issued an order to show cause why it should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the plaintiff’s state-law Unruh Civil Rights Act claim and related state-law claims.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The exercise of supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1367 is discretionary and requires consideration of judicial economy, convenience, fairness, and comity, along with the statutory grounds for declining jurisdiction.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential district court order

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Civil Rights Act claim and any related state-law claims.
2. Whether the plaintiff and counsel must provide information and declarations concerning the amount of statutory damages and plaintiff's status as a high-frequency litigant before the court decides whether to retain supplemental jurisdiction.

HOLDINGS

1. Supplemental jurisdiction is discretionary rather than a plaintiff's right, and the court may decline to exercise it over a supplemental state-law claim when a statutory ground under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c) or other relevant considerations warrant declining jurisdiction.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“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.” (at 2)

“Therefore, as a matter of comity, and in deference to California’s substantial interest in discouraging unverified disability discrimination claims, the Court declines supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff’s Unruh Act claim.” (at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The complaint alleges a violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act involving access to a place of public accommodation and seeks injunctive relief. It also asserts a California Unruh Civil Rights Act claim for damages and requests supplemental jurisdiction over that state-law claim.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a complaint asserting an ADA claim for injunctive relief and an Unruh Civil Rights Act claim for damages, requesting 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 written responses and declarations addressing the amount of statutory damages and whether plaintiff qualifies as a high-frequency litigant.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *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/lamar-myers-v-tex-motorwerkes-llc-q1ab7vjw>