

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Ana Ventura v. Hilario Egay

Ventura · No. 2:24-cv-03700-MEMF-AS · Decided May 30, 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 arising from alleged disability-access violations. The order requires disclosures regarding statutory damages and declarations addressing whether the plaintiff and counsel qualify as high-frequency litigants under California law.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Maame Ewusi-Mensah Frimpong
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	May 30, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-03700-MEMF-AS
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court issued an order to show cause why it should not decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the plaintiff's California-law claims.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c), the court considers whether to exercise supplemental jurisdiction, weighing judicial economy, convenience, fairness, and comity.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil procedure
- Americans with Disabilities Act
- Federal jurisdiction
- California disability-access law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Ventura should be required to show cause why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over her California-law claims.
2. Whether Ventura and her counsel must provide information and declarations concerning statutory damages and high-frequency-litigant status before the court determines whether to exercise supplemental jurisdiction.

HOLDINGS

1. The court ordered Ventura to show cause in writing why it should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over her Unruh Act, California Disabled Persons Act, California Health and Safety Code, and negligence claims.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“In light of the foregoing, the Court orders Ventura to show cause in writing why the Court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act claim, the California Disabled Persons Act claim, the California Health and Safety Code claim, and the negligence claim.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Ventura alleged that she encountered construction-related accessibility barriers at defendants' business and asserted an ADA claim for injunctive relief. She also asserted California claims under the Unruh Civil Rights Act, the California Disabled Persons Act, California Health and Safety Code § 19955 et seq., and negligence. The order indicates that the California claims may implicate California's heightened pleading and high-frequency-litigant requirements for construction-accessibility actions.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Ana Ventura filed a federal complaint on May 3, 2024, asserting an ADA claim and claims under California law for damages and injunctive relief. The court reviewed the pleading and ordered Ventura to explain why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claims, with supporting declarations 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)