

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.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Michael W. Fitzgerald
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	July 30, 2025
DOCKET	EDCV 25-1915-MWF(MBKx)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court sua sponte issued an order to show cause requiring Plaintiff to explain why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Civil Rights Act claim and other state-law claims.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court may examine subject matter jurisdiction sua sponte at any time during the pendency of the action. Whether to exercise supplemental jurisdiction is governed by 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished and nonprecedential

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- federalism
- ada / disability
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Civil Rights Act claim and other state-law claims.
2. Whether Plaintiff must provide information concerning the amount of Unruh Act statutory damages sought and potential high-frequency-litigant status to assist the court in evaluating supplemental jurisdiction.
3. Whether the court may raise subject matter jurisdiction sua sponte during the pendency of the action.

HOLDINGS

1. A district court may raise and examine the question of subject matter jurisdiction sua sponte at any time while the action is pending.
2. The court did not yet decide whether to exercise supplemental jurisdiction; instead, it ordered Plaintiff to show cause why supplemental jurisdiction should be exercised and warned that the court could decline jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c).

KEY QUOTATIONS

“This Court has a sua sponte obligation to confirm that it has subject matter jurisdiction.” (at 1)

“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 over the Unruh Act claim and the other state law claims alleged by Plaintiff.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The complaint alleges an ADA violation seeking injunctive relief, an Unruh Civil Rights Act claim seeking damages, and additional state-law claims. The court understood supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a) to be the sole basis for jurisdiction over the Unruh Act claim. The court requested information about the amount of statutory damages sought and whether Plaintiff or Plaintiff's counsel qualified as a high-frequency litigant under California law.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a complaint asserting an Americans with Disabilities Act claim for injunctive relief, an Unruh Civil Rights Act claim for damages, and other state-law claims. The court identified supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a) as the sole jurisdictional basis for the Unruh Act claim and ordered Plaintiff to show cause why supplemental jurisdiction should be exercised. The response was due August 13, 2025, and the court warned that failure to respond could result in dismissal without prejudice or declining supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claims.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Arroyo v. Rosas, 19 F.4th 1202, 1211-14 (9th Cir. 2021)
- Nevada v. Bank of Am. Corp., 672 F.3d 661, 673 (9th Cir. 2012)
- Snell v. Cleveland, Inc., 316 F.3d 822, 826 (9th Cir. 2002)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-central-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-for/2025/k-phillip-taylor-v-ivan-gonzalez-vm4sotgn>