

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF  
CALIFORNIA**

**Theresa Brooke v. Mehta N. Bharat, et al.**

Brooke · No. 1:25-cv-01145 JLT CDB · Decided October 1, 2025

---

**OPINION**

Brooke

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 THERESA BROOKE, Case No. 1:25-cv-01145 JLT CDB 12 Plaintiff, ORDER  
ADOPTING FINDINGS AND

RECOMMENDATIONS AND DECLINING

13 v. SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION OVER

PLAINTIFF’S STATE LAW CLAIM

14 MEHTA N. BHARAT, et al., (Doc. 6) 15 Defendants. 16 17 Theresa Brooke seeks to hold  
Mehta N. Bharat and Nita Bharat liable for violations of the 18 Americans with Disabilities Act  
and California’s Unruh Civil Rights Act. (Doc. 1.) Following 19 an order to show cause regarding  
jurisdiction (Doc. 4), the assigned magistrate judge issued 20 Findings and Recommendations,  
recommending the Court decline to exercise supplemental 21 jurisdiction over Plaintiff’s state law  
claim and dismiss the Unruh Act claim without prejudice 22 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c)(4).  
(Doc. 6.) 23 The Court served the Findings and Recommendations on Plaintiff<sup>1</sup> and informed her  
that 24 any objections must be filed within 14 days of the date of service. (Doc. 6 at 8.) The Court  
25 advised her that “failure to file objections within the specified time may result in the waiver of  
26 rights on appeal.” (Id., citing *Wilkerson v. Wheeler*, 772 F.3d 834, 838-839 (9th Cir. 2014).) 27  
Plaintiff did not file objections, and the time to do so has expired. 1 According to 28 U.S.C. §  
636(b)(1), this Court performed a de novo review of the case. 2 | Having carefully reviewed the  
matter, the Court concludes the Findings and Recommendations 3 | are supported by the record  
and by proper analysis. Thus, the Court ORDERS: 4 1. The Findings and Recommendations dated  
September 15, 2025 (Doc. 6) are 5 ADOPTED in full. 6 2. The Court DECLINES to exercise  
supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff’s claim 7 arising under state law pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §  
1367(c)(4). 8 3. Plaintiffs claim for violations of the Unruh Act are DISMISSED without 9  
prejudice. 10 IT IS SO ORDERED. 12 Dated: \_ October 1, 2025 Cerin | Tower

TED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

---

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-for/2025/theresa-brooke-v-mehta-n-bharat-et-al-vhqi6hxy>