

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Marquise Bailey v. Ana L. Gonzales et al.

No. 2:25-cv-10492-MWC-MBK, United States District Court for the Central District of California (November 6, 2025)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court orders Plaintiff to show cause why the court should not decline supplemental jurisdiction over claims under California’s Unruh Civil Rights Act and related state laws. The order requires Plaintiff to identify the statutory damages sought and provide declarations addressing whether 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	Michelle Williams Court
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	November 6, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-10492-MWC-MBK
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court issued an order to show cause requiring Plaintiff to explain why the court should not decline supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act and related state-law claims.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights
- disability discrimination

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether Plaintiff should be required to show cause why the court should not decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act and related state-law claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c)(4).

2. What information Plaintiff and Plaintiff's counsel must provide for the court to evaluate the statutory-damages request and high-frequency-litigant status.

HOLDINGS

1. The court ordered Plaintiff to show cause in writing why the court should not decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act and related state-law claims.
2. Plaintiff was required to identify the amount of statutory damages sought and Plaintiff and Plaintiff's counsel were required to provide declarations under penalty of perjury containing facts necessary to determine whether they satisfy California's definition of a high-frequency litigant.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Failure to respond as ordered will result in the Court declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act and related state law claims and dismissing those claims without prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c).”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The complaint alleges violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act and several California statutes, including the Unruh Act, the California Disabled Persons Act, and California Health and Safety Code section 19955 et seq., as well as negligence. Plaintiff seeks damages and injunctive relief. The court required information about the amount of statutory damages sought and facts relevant to the high-frequency-litigant provisions of California law before deciding whether to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claims.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a complaint asserting claims for damages and injunctive relief under the Americans with Disabilities Act, the California Unruh Civil Rights Act, the California Disabled Persons Act, California Health and Safety Code section 19955 et seq., and negligence. Before making a final determination regarding supplemental jurisdiction, the court ordered Plaintiff to submit a written response identifying the statutory damages sought and declarations addressing whether Plaintiff and counsel qualify as high-frequency litigants under California law.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Arroyo v. Rosas, 19 F.4th 1202 (9th Cir. 2021)

OPINION

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL Case No. 2:25-cv-10492-MWC-MBK Date: November 6, 2025
Title: Marquise Bailey v. Ana L. Gonzales et al. Present: The Honorable Michelle Williams Court,

United States District Judge T. Jackson Not Reported Deputy Clerk Court Reporter / Recorder
Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs: Attorneys Present for Defendants: N/A N/A Proceedings: (In
Chambers) Order to Show Cause re: Supplemental Jurisdiction The Complaint asserts claims for
damages and injunctive relief arising out of alleged violations of the Americans with Disabilities
Act, California's Unruh Civil Rights Act ("Unruh Act"), the California Disabled Persons Act,
California Health & Safety Code § 19955, et seq., and based on a theory of negligence.

See Dkt. # 1. The Court ORDERS Plaintiff to show cause in writing no later than November 21,
2025, why it should not decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act and any
related state law claims. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1367(c)(4); *Arroyo v. Rosas*, 19 F.4th 1202 (9th Cir.
2021).

The response to this Order to Show Cause must identify the amount of statutory damages Plaintiff
seeks to recover. Plaintiff and Plaintiff's counsel must also support their responses to the Order to
Show Cause with declarations, signed under penalty of perjury, providing all facts necessary for
the Court to determine if they satisfy the definition of a "high-frequency litigant" as provided by
California Civil Procedure Code §§ 425.55(b)(1) & (2).

Failure to respond as ordered will result in the Court declining to exercise supplemental
jurisdiction over the Unruh Act and related state law claims and dismissing those claims without
prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c). IT IS SO ORDERED. Initials of Preparer TJ