

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Miriam Maldonado v. Manuel F. Garcia

Maldonado v. Garcia · No. CV 23-1666-DMG (MARx); 2:23-cv-01666-DMG-MAR · Decided March 14, 2023

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 state-law claims under California disability-access and related statutes. The court required a written response identifying the statutory damages sought and declarations addressing whether the plaintiff and counsel qualified as high-frequency litigants under California law.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Dolly M. Gee
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	March 14, 2023
DOCKET	CV 23-1666-DMG (MARx); 2:23-cv-01666-DMG-MAR
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The complaint asserted a federal claim for injunctive relief under the Americans with Disabilities Act and state-law claims for damages under the Unruh Civil Rights Act, the Disabled Persons Act, the Health and Safety Code, and negligence. The court issued an order to show cause why it should not decline supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claims.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court would exercise supplemental jurisdiction under the discretionary standards of 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c), considering judicial economy, convenience, fairness, comity, and whether exceptional circumstances provide compelling reasons for declining jurisdiction.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished, nonprecedential district-court order
PARTIES	Miriam Maldonado v. Manuel F. Garcia

TOPICS

subject matter jurisdiction

civil procedure

ada / disability

civil rights

pleadings

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

supplemental jurisdiction

Americans with Disabilities Act

California disability-access litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over plaintiff's Unruh Civil Rights Act, Disabled Persons Act, Health and Safety Code, and negligence claims.
2. Whether plaintiff should be required to identify the statutory damages sought and provide declarations addressing whether plaintiff and counsel qualify as high-frequency litigants under California law.

HOLDINGS

1. The court did not finally decide whether to exercise supplemental jurisdiction; instead, it ordered plaintiff to show cause in writing why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act, Disabled Persons Act, Health and Safety Code, and negligence claims.
2. Plaintiff must identify the amount of statutory damages sought and plaintiff and counsel must submit declarations under penalty of perjury containing facts necessary to determine whether they satisfy California's 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.’” (at 1)

“In light of the foregoing, the Court orders Plaintiff to show cause in writing why the Court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act, Disabled Persons Act, Health & Safety Code, and Negligence claims.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The complaint alleged a violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act and sought injunctive relief, along with damages under California disability-access and related laws. The state-law claims apparently involved construction-access allegations under the Unruh Civil Rights Act. The court noted California's heightened pleading requirements and high-frequency-litigant provisions designed to address allegedly baseless or vexatious disability-access litigation.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a complaint asserting an ADA claim and related California-law claims. The district court determined that it appeared to have supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claims and ordered plaintiff to

explain why the court should exercise that jurisdiction, warning that failure to respond could result in dismissal of those claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c).

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- City of Chicago v. International College of Surgeons, 522 U.S. 156, 173, 118 S. Ct. 523, 534 (1997)
- Carnegie-Mellon University v. Cohill, 484 U.S. 343, 350 (1988)
- Schutza v. Cuddeback, 262 F. Supp. 3d 1025, 1031 (S.D. Cal. 2017)
- Arroyo v. Rosas, 19 F.4th 1202, 1211 (9th Cir. 2021)