

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Moises Villalobos v. Big Shotz Bar & Grill, et al.

No. 2:25-cv-06674-MEMF-PVC (C.D. Cal. July 30, 2025) · No. 2:25-cv-06674-MEMF-PVC · Decided July 30, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California ordered Plaintiff Moises Villalobos to show cause why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over his California state-law claims arising from alleged disability-access violations. The order requests information about statutory damages and declarations addressing whether Villalobos and his counsel qualify as high-frequency litigants under California law.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Maame Ewusi-Mensah Frimpong
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	July 30, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-06674-MEMF-PVC
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court issued an order to show cause why it should not decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state-law claims.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c), a federal court has discretion to decline supplemental jurisdiction over state-law claims, considering the values of judicial economy, convenience, fairness, and comity.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished, nonprecedential district-court order
PARTIES	Moises Villalobos v. Big Shotz Bar & Grill, Raymond Ted Young, Does 1 to 10

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- civil procedure
- pleadings
- ada / disability
- construction law

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure civil rights disability discrimination supplemental jurisdiction
construction-accessibility litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should require Plaintiff to show cause why it should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act, California Disabled Persons Act, California Health and Safety Code, and negligence claims.
2. What information and declarations Plaintiff and counsel must provide regarding statutory damages and potential classification as high-frequency litigants under California law.

HOLDINGS

1. The court ordered Villalobos to show cause in writing why the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act, California Disabled Persons Act, California Health and Safety Code, and negligence claims.
2. Villalobos must identify the amount of statutory damages sought, and Villalobos and counsel must submit declarations under penalty of perjury providing facts necessary to determine whether they satisfy California's high-frequency-litigant definitions.

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)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Villalobos alleged that Defendants violated the Americans with Disabilities Act and asserted related California claims involving alleged construction-related accessibility barriers. The complaint invoked federal-question jurisdiction for the ADA claim and purported to invoke pendent or supplemental jurisdiction for the state-law claims. The court noted that California imposes heightened pleading and disclosure requirements on certain construction-accessibility claims and ordered further information concerning Villalobos's and counsel's potential high-frequency-litigant status.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Villalobos filed a complaint on July 22, 2025, asserting an Americans with Disabilities Act claim and state-law claims under the Unruh Civil Rights Act, the California Disabled Persons Act, California Health and Safety Code section 19955, and negligence. The court required Villalobos to explain why supplemental jurisdiction should be exercised over the state-law claims and directed Villalobos and counsel to submit declarations addressing whether they qualify as high-frequency litigants.

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)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-central-district-of-cal/2025/moises-villalobos-v-big-shotz-bar-and-grill-et-al-zfz3djs0>