

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Larry Dunn v. Mud Australia, Incorporated

Dunn v. Mud Australia · No. CV 25-4527 PA (MARx) · Decided May 21, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California ordered the plaintiff to show cause why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over claims under California’s Unruh Civil Rights Act and any other state-law claims. The court also required disclosures concerning statutory damages and whether the plaintiff and counsel qualify as high-frequency litigants under California law, with a response due June 4, 2025.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Percy Anderson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	May 21, 2025
DOCKET	CV 25-4527 PA (MARx)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	After the complaint was filed, the court issued an order to show cause requiring the plaintiff to explain why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act claim and any other state-law claims.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- disability discrimination
- supplemental jurisdiction
- civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Civil Rights Act claim and any other state-law claims asserted in the complaint.
2. What amount of statutory damages the plaintiff seeks.
3. Whether the plaintiff and plaintiff's counsel satisfy the California statutory definition of a high-frequency litigant.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The supplemental jurisdiction statute “reflects the understanding that, when deciding whether to exercise supplemental jurisdiction, ‘a federal court should consider and weigh in each case, and at every stage of the litigation, the values of judicial economy, convenience, fairness, and comity.’””

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The complaint alleged a violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act and sought injunctive relief. It also sought damages under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act. The court required information about the amount of statutory damages sought and facts bearing on whether the plaintiff and counsel qualified as high-frequency litigants under California law.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The complaint asserted an ADA claim for injunctive relief and a California Unruh Civil Rights Act claim for damages. The court concluded that it appeared to possess only supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act and other state-law claims and ordered the plaintiff to respond by June 4, 2025. The order warned that an inadequate or untimely response could result in dismissal without prejudice or declination of supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claims.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- City of Chicago v. International College of Surgeons, 522 U.S. 156, 173, 118 S. Ct. 523, 534, 139 L. Ed. 2d 525 (1997)
- Carnegie-Mellon University v. Cohill, 484 U.S. 343, 350, 108 S. Ct. 614, 619, 98 L. Ed. 2d 720 (1988)