

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF  
CALIFORNIA

Oscar Ramos v. Metro by T-Mobile; Gong Investments, LLC,  
individually and d/b/a Metro by T-Mobile; and Does 1 to 50 inclusive

Ramos · No. 2:24-cv-03062-DJC-CKD · Decided May 15, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California granted Techno CA LLC's motion to intervene in Oscar Ramos's action alleging violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act and related California statutes. The court declined to dismiss T-Mobile USA, Inc. or Metro by T-Mobile because the identity of the store's operator during the relevant period required discovery. The court also denied the motions to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction and for sanctions, finding that the ADA claims were non-frivolous and that bad faith had not been shown.

CASE DETAILS

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| COURT                 | United States District Court for the Eastern District of California                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| WRITING FOR THE COURT | Daniel J. Calabretta                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| JURISDICTION          | United States District Court for the Eastern District of California                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| DECIDED               | May 15, 2025                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| DOCKET                | 2:24-cv-03062-DJC-CKD                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| DISPOSITION           | other                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| PROCEDURAL POSTURE    | Non-party Techno CA LLC moved to intervene, dismiss the complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, and impose sanctions. The district court granted intervention but denied dismissal and sanctions.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| STANDARD OF REVIEW    | For intervention under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24(a), the court applied the four-factor intervention standard and assessed the factors liberally in favor of the movant. For the jurisdictional motion, the court assessed whether the complaint presented a non-frivolous federal claim sufficient to establish federal-question jurisdiction under Rule 12(b)(1). Sanctions were evaluated under the court's inherent authority to sanction bad-faith conduct. |
| PRECEDENTIAL VALUE    | Unpublished district court order; precedential status not identified                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |

TOPICS

intervention

subject matter jurisdiction

motions to dismiss

sanctions

ada / disability

## PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedure

Americans with Disabilities Act

Disability access

Federal jurisdiction

Sanctions

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Techno CA LLC satisfied the requirements for intervention as of right under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24(a).
2. Whether the complaint should be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction because the alleged accessible parking space was not a public accommodation under the ADA.
3. Whether the complaint should be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction because the store counter was allegedly ADA-compliant and the claim was therefore moot or lacked standing.
4. Whether sanctions were warranted based on alleged bad-faith pleading or failure to name the correct defendant.
5. Whether T-Mobile USA, Inc. or Metro by T-Mobile should be dismissed from the action at that stage of the proceedings.

## HOLDINGS

1. Techno CA LLC could intervene as of right because its motion was timely, it asserted a significantly protectable interest in the store involved in the action, disposition could impair its ability to protect that interest, and the existing defendants did not adequately represent its interests.
2. The court had subject matter jurisdiction because Ramos asserted a non-frivolous ADA claim, and an accessible parking lot can constitute a place of public accommodation under the ADA.
3. The disputed facts concerning whether the service counter complied with the ADA during Ramos's 2024 visits did not defeat subject matter jurisdiction or justify dismissal at that stage.
4. The court declined to dismiss T-Mobile USA, Inc. or Metro by T-Mobile because the record did not definitively establish which entity operated the store during Ramos's visits, and discovery could resolve that issue.
5. Sanctions were not warranted because the record did not show that Ramos or his counsel acted in bad faith by naming the defendants or declining to amend the complaint as requested.

## KEY QUOTATIONS

*“A parking lot can be a public space that would be covered by the ADA.”* (at 5)

*“a valid disagreement over the facts of the case does not render a claim frivolous”* (at 6)

*“Because the Court does not find Plaintiff acted in bad faith by naming parties beyond Techno CA LLC in the complaint, or amending the complaint per Techno CA LLC's request, Intervenor's request for sanctions is DENIED.”* (at 7)

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Ramos, who uses a wheelchair, alleged that he encountered inaccessible features at a Metro by T-Mobile store in Fairfield, California, during visits on March 8, June 13, and September 24, 2024. He alleged that the accessible parking space was improperly located, designated, signed, and sized, that a ramp impeded access, and that the service counter was too narrow and high. Techno CA LLC asserted that it was the current tenant and operator of the store but did not begin operating it until after October 2024. Photographs purportedly showing an ADA-compliant counter in January 2025 did not resolve whether the counter complied during Ramos's 2024 visits.

## PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Oscar Ramos filed claims under the Americans with Disabilities Act and related California statutes based on alleged accessibility barriers at a Metro by T-Mobile store. T-Mobile USA, Inc. answered and asserted that it had been erroneously sued and did not operate the store during the relevant period. Techno CA LLC, which claimed to be the current tenant and operator, moved to intervene and sought dismissal and sanctions. The motion was submitted without oral argument under Local Rule 230(g).

## DISPOSITION

other

## CASES CITED

- Nat'l Fed'n of the Blind of Cal. v. Uber Techs., Inc., 103 F. Supp. 3d 1073, 1078 (N.D. Cal. 2015)
- White v. Lee, 227 F.3d 1214, 1242 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Safe Air for Everyone v. Meyer, 373 F.3d 1035, 1039 (9th Cir. 2004)
- Thompson v. McCombe, 99 F.3d 352, 353 (9th Cir. 1996)
- Arbaugh v. Y&H Corp., 546 U.S. 500, 506 (2006)
- Sw. Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Berg, 268 F.3d 810, 818, 820 (9th Cir. 2001)
- Idaho Farm Bureau Fed'n v. Babbitt, 58 F.3d 1392, 1397 (9th Cir. 1995)
- United States v. State of Or., 913 F.2d 576, 588 (9th Cir. 1990)
- Kalani v. Castle Vill. LLC, 14 F. Supp. 3d 1359, 1370 (E.D. Cal. 2014)
- Bollard v. Cal. Province of the Soc'y of Jesus, 196 F.3d 940, 951 (9th Cir. 1999)
- Markel v. Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of Am., 124 F.4th 796 (9th Cir. 2024)
- Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. v. Haeger, 581 U.S. 101, 102 (2017)