

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Michael Rhambo v. Ping Jung Hsu, et al.

Rhambo v. Hsu · No. 2:25-cv-08756-DSF-BFM · Decided October 3, 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 order cites California’s statutory regime concerning high-frequency disability-access litigants and directs the plaintiff and counsel to submit declarations addressing that status, along with the amount of statutory damages sought. A response was required by October 17, 2025, and failure to respond could result in dismissal of the action or state-law claims.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Dale S. Fischer
DECIDED	October 3, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-08756-DSF-BFM
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court 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 any other state-law claims.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- federal courts
- disability rights
- supplemental jurisdiction

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Civil Rights Act claim and any other state-law claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

2. Whether plaintiff and plaintiff's counsel must provide information and declarations addressing whether plaintiff meets California's definition of a high-frequency litigant.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“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 declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act and other state law claims, if any, and the dismissal of any such claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c).”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The complaint alleges an ADA violation and seeks injunctive relief, along with damages under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act. The court noted that it appeared to possess supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act claim and any other state-law claims. The court also identified California statutory provisions regulating construction-related disability-access claims brought by certain high-frequency litigants.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a complaint asserting an Americans with Disabilities Act claim for injunctive relief and a California Unruh Civil Rights Act claim for damages. Before further proceedings, the district court ordered plaintiff and plaintiff's counsel to submit declarations and supporting information concerning plaintiff's alleged status as a high-frequency litigant and to explain why supplemental jurisdiction should be exercised over the state-law claims.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- City of Chicago v. International College of Surgeons, 522 U.S. 156, 173 (1997)
- Carnegie-Mellon University v. Cohill, 484 U.S. 343, 350 (1988)
- Vo v. Choi, 49 F.4th 1167 (9th Cir. 2022)
- Arroyo v. Rosas, 19 F.4th 1202 (9th Cir. 2021)

OPINION

Michael Rhambo v. Ping Jung Hsu, et al.

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MICHAEL RHAMBO 2:25-cv-08756-DSF-BFM

Plaintiff(s),

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

v. PING JUNG HSU, et al. Defendant(s). 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. §§ 12010-12213, and a claim for damages pursuant to California's Unruh Civil Rights Act (Unruh Act), Cal. Civ. Code §§ 51-53. It appears that the Court possesses only supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act claim, and any other state law claim that plaintiff may have alleged pursuant to the Court's supplemental jurisdiction. See 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a). 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.'" *City of Chicago v. Int'l Coll. of Surgeons*, 522 U.S. 156, 173 (1997) (emphasis added) (quoting *Carnegie-Mellon Univ. v. Cohill*, 484 U.S. 343, 350 (1988)). California has a statutory regime to address "high-frequency litigants" bringing construction-related disability access claims. This includes specific pleading requirements and a higher filing fee for litigants who meet certain criteria. See Cal. Civ. Code § 55.31(b); Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 425.50; Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 425.55; Cal. Gov't Code § 70616.5. Numerous district courts have found that this California legislative attempt to regulate the prosecution of disability access cases by certain high-frequency plaintiffs provides "compelling reasons" and constitutes an "exceptional circumstance" justifying the decline of supplemental jurisdiction over disability state law claims in certain cases. This approach has been upheld by the Ninth Circuit multiple times. See *Vo v. Choi*, 49 F.4th 1167 (9th Cir. 2022); *Arroyo v. Rosas*, 19 F.4th 1202 (9th Cir. 2021). The Court therefore orders plaintiff to show cause in writing why the Court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act claim and any other state law claim asserted in the Complaint. See 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c). In responding to this Order to Show Cause, plaintiff shall identify the amount of statutory damages plaintiff seeks to recover. Plaintiff and plaintiff's counsel shall 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 sections 425.55(b)(1) & (2). Plaintiff shall file a response to this Order to Show Cause by no later than October 17, 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 declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act and other state law claims, if any, and the dismissal of any such claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c). IT IS SO ORDERED. Date: October 3, 2025 Dale S. Fischer United States District Judge