

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

K. Phillip Taylor v. Ivan Gonzalez

No. EDCV 25-1915-MWF(MBKx), United States District Court for the Central District of California (July 30,
2025)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California orders Plaintiff to show cause why the Court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over claims under California’s Unruh Civil Rights Act and other state laws. The order requires information regarding the statutory damages sought and whether Plaintiff or counsel qualifies as a high-frequency litigant, with a response due August 13, 2025, and warns that failure to respond may lead to dismissal.

OPINION

K. Phillip Taylor v. Ivan Gonzalez

PER CURIAM.

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. EDCV 25-1915-MWF(MBKx) Date: July 30, 2025 Title K. Phillip Taylor v. Ivan Gonzalez, et al. Present: The Honorable: MICHAEL W. FITZGERALD, United States District Judge Rita Sanchez Not Reported Deputy Clerk Court Reporter / Recorder Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs: Attorneys Present for Defendants: Not Present Not Present Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION

The Complaint filed in this action asserts a claim for injunctive relief arising out of an alleged violation of the Americans With Disabilities Act (“ADA”), 42 U.S.C. §§ 12101-12213, a claim for damages pursuant to the Unruh Civil Rights Act (“Unruh Act”), Cal. Civ. Code §§ 51–53, and other state law claims alleged by Plaintiff. The sole basis for jurisdiction over the Unruh Act claim is supplemental jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a). The Court, however, may decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction for the reasons delineated in § 1367(c). See also *Arroyo v. Rosas*, 19 F.4th 1202, 1211–14 (9th Cir. 2021) (holding district courts may decline supplemental jurisdiction over ADA-based Unruh Act claims because of “very substantial threat to federal-state comity” presented by plaintiffs’ use of federal courts to evade California’s Unruh Act reforms). This Court has a sua sponte obligation to confirm that it has subject matter jurisdiction. *Nevada v. Bank of Am. Corp.*, 672 F.3d 661, 673 (9th Cir. 2012) (“[I]t is well established that ‘a court may raise the question of subject matter jurisdiction, sua sponte, at any time during the pendency of the action’” (quoting *Snell v. Cleveland, Inc.*, 316 F.3d 822, 826 (9th Cir. 2002))). Therefore, to

assist this Court in its duty, Plaintiff is ORDERED to SHOW CAUSE in writing as to why this Court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. EDCV 25-1915-MWF(MBKx) Date: July 30, 2025 Title K. Phillip Taylor v. Ivan Gonzalez, et al. over the Unruh Act claim and the other state law claims alleged by Plaintiff. The Response to the Order to Show Cause shall include (1) the amount of statutory damages sought pursuant to the Unruh Act; and (2) sufficient facts for the Court to determine whether Plaintiff or Plaintiff's counsel meet the definition of a "high- frequency litigant" as defined in California Code of Civil Procedure section 425.55(b)(1) & (2). These facts shall be set forth in declarations signed under penalty of perjury. The Response shall be filed on or before AUGUST 13, 2025. Failure to timely or adequately respond to this Order to Show Cause may, without further warning, result in the dismissal of the entire action without prejudice or the Court's declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act claim and the dismissal of that claim pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c). IT IS SO ORDERED.