

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Guri Gonzalez v. 1233 S. Hope, Inc. et al.

Gonzalez · No. 2:25-cv-10136-FLA-MBK · Decided November 3, 2025

SUMMARY

The Central District of California orders the plaintiff to show cause why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over claims under California’s Unruh Civil Rights Act and related state law. The order requests briefing on 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	Fernando L. Aenlle-Rocha
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	November 3, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-10136-FLA-MBK
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court issued an order to show cause requiring the plaintiff to explain why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Civil Rights Act claim and related state-law claims.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown
PARTIES	Guri Gonzalez v. 1233 S. Hope, Inc. et al.

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- disability access litigation
- supplemental jurisdiction
- civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over plaintiff's Unruh Civil Rights Act claim and any related state-law claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
2. What information plaintiff and counsel must provide to permit the court to evaluate the discretionary jurisdictional factors and whether they qualify as high-frequency litigants under California law.

HOLDINGS

1. Supplemental jurisdiction is discretionary rather than a right of the plaintiff, and the district court may decline to exercise it under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c), including when exceptional circumstances and compelling reasons counsel against jurisdiction.
2. The court did not yet decide whether to decline supplemental jurisdiction; instead, it ordered plaintiff to show cause and provide information relevant to the jurisdictional determination.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The United States Supreme Court has recognized supplemental jurisdiction “is a doctrine of discretion, not of plaintiff’s right, and that district courts can decline to exercise jurisdiction over pendent claims for a number of valid reasons.””

“when deciding whether to exercise supplemental jurisdiction, “a federal court should consider and weigh in each case, and at every state of the litigation, the values of judicial economy, convenience, fairness, and comity””

“Failure to timely or adequately respond to this Order to Show Cause may result in the court declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act claim and any related state law claims and dismissing such claim or claims without further notice”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The complaint alleges a violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act and asserts a related California Unruh Civil Rights Act claim seeking damages. The state-law claim appears to involve construction-related accessibility allegations, an area in which California has adopted heightened pleading requirements and a high-frequency-litigant fee. The court relied on the relationship between the federal and state claims and California's interest in regulating disability-access litigation in deciding to require a response before determining whether to exercise supplemental jurisdiction.

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 under 28 U.S.C. § 1367. Before resolving the jurisdictional question, the district court ordered plaintiff to provide written reasons, identify the statutory damages sought, and submit declarations addressing whether plaintiff and counsel satisfy California's high-frequency-litigant provisions.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- City of Chi. v. Int'l Coll. of Surgeons, 522 U.S. 156 (1997)
- Carnegie-Mellon Univ. v. Cohill, 484 U.S. 343 (1988)
- Acri v. Varian Assocs., 114 F.3d 999 (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/guri-gonzalez-v-1233-s-hope-inc-et-al-t13omkfk>