1 2 3 JS-6 6 JS-6 7 JS-6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 SANDI RUSH, 11 SANDI RUSH, 12 Flaintiff, 13 v. 14 MK-G.S. RESTAURANT 15 JOCO NO. 177 BIG 5 CORP. dba 16 v. 17 Defendants. 18 Presently before the court is the Ex Parte Application to 19 Dismiss Case filed by Defendants/Cross Claimants Rubio Holdings, 12 LLC and Crystal Enterprises, LLC (collectively, "Applicants"). 19 Disabilities Act complaint against several defendants, including 12 This action was initially filed as an Americans with 19 Disabilities Act complaint against several defendants, including 12 Applicants and Cross Claimant Big 5 Corporation ("Big 5"). 13 Applicants and Big 5 subsequently filed cross claims against each 14 Disabilities Act complaint against have been resolved. Thus, only 15 LC and Cryss claims remain.		
2 3 4 5 5 JS - 6 6 JS - 6 7 8 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 11 SANDI RUSH, Case No. CV 10-04635 DDP (MANx) 12 Plaintiff, 13 v. 14 W.K.S. RESTAURANT 15 Defendants. 16 et al. 17 Defendants. 18 Presently before the court is the Ex Parte Application to 19 Dismiss Case filed by Defendants/Cross Claimants Rubio Holdings, 10 LLC and Crystal Enterprises, LLC (collectively, "Applicants"). 17 Disabilities Act complaint against several defendants, including 18 This action was initially filed as an Americans with 19 Disabilities Act complaint against several defendants, including 19 Applicants and Cross Claimant Big 5 Corporation ("Big 5"). 19 Applicants and Big 5 subsequently filed cross claims against each 10 other. All of Plaintiff's claims have been resolved. Thus, only	1	
3 JS - 6 4 JS - 6 5 JS - 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 Plaintiff, 11 SANDI RUSH, 12 Plaintiff, 13 v. 14 W.K.S. RESTAURANT 15 bOCO NO. If' BIG 5 CORP. dba 16 v. 17 Defendants. 18 Presently before the court is the Ex Parte Application to 19 Dismiss Case filed by Defendants/Cross Claimants Rubio Holdings, 10 LLC and Crystal Enterprises, LLC (collectively, "Applicants"). 19 Disabilities Act complaint against several defendants, including 12 This action was initially filed as an Americans with 13 Disabilities Act complaint against several defendants, including 14 Applicants and Cross Claimant Big 5 Corporation ("Big 5"). 15 Applicants and Big 5 subsequently filed cross claims against each 16 other. All of Plaintiff's claims have been resolved. Thus, only		
JS-6 JS-6 JS-6 JS-6 JS-6 JS-6 JS-6 JS-6		0
6 JS-0 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 Plaintiff, 11 SANDI RUSH, 12 Plaintiff, 13 V. 14 W.K.S. RESTAURANT 15 DOC NO17' BIG 5 CORP. dba) 16 et al. 17 Defendants. 18 Presently before the court is the Ex Parte Application to 19 Dismiss Case filed by Defendants/Cross Claimants Rubio Holdings, 20 LLC and Crystal Enterprises, LLC (collectively, "Applicants"). 21 (Dkt. No. 36.) The court notes that as of the date of this order, 22 no opposition to the application has been filed. 23 This action was initially filed as an Americans with 24 Disabilities Act complaint against several defendants, including 25 Applicants and Cross Claimant Big 5 Corporation ("Big 5"). 26 Applicants and Big 5 subsequently filed cross claims against each 27 other. All of Plaintiff's claims have been resolved. Thus, only	4	
6 7 7 8 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 11 SANDI RUSH, Case No. CV 10-04635 DDP (MANx) 12 Plaintiff,) 13 V.) 14 M.K.S. RESTAURANT) 15 bcCo No. 17; BIG 5 CORP. dba)) 16 et al.) 17	5	JS - 6
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 11 SANDI RUSH, Case No. CV 10-04635 DDP (MANx) 12 Plaintiff, 13 V. 14 W.K.S. RESTAURANT 15 ORDER DISMISSING CASE 16 V. 17 Defendants. 18 Presently before the court is the Ex Parte Application to 19 Dismiss Case filed by Defendants/Cross Claimants Rubio Holdings, 20 LLC and Crystal Enterprises, LLC (collectively, "Applicants"). 21 (Dkt. No. 36.) The court notes that as of the date of this order, 22 no opposition to the application has been filed. 23 This action was initially filed as an Americans with 24 Disabilities Act complaint against several defendants, including 25 Applicants and Cross Claimant Big 5 Corporation ("Big 5"). 26 Applicants and Big 5 subsequently filed cross claims against each 27 other. All of Plaintiff's claims have been resolved. Thus, only	б	
9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 SANDI RUSH, Case No. CV 10-04635 DDP (MANx) 12 Plaintiff, 13 v. 14 15 16 17 18 Presently before the court is the Ex Parte Application to 19 Dismiss Case filed by Defendants/Cross Claimants Rubio Holdings, 10 LLC and Crystal Enterprises, LLC (collectively, "Applicants"). 11 (Dkt. No. 36.) The court notes that as of the date of this order, 16 Disabilities Act complaint against several defendants, including 19 Applicants and Cross Claimant Big 5 Corporation ("Big 5"). 10 Applicants and Big 5 subsequently filed cross claims against each 17	7	
10 11 SANDI RUSH, Case No. CV 10-04635 DDP (MANx) 12 Plaintiff, 13 v. 14 Mr.K.S. RESTAURANT 15 v. 16 et al. 17 Defendants. 18 Presently before the court is the Ex Parte Application to 19 Dismiss Case filed by Defendants/Cross Claimants Rubio Holdings, 20 LLC and Crystal Enterprises, LLC (collectively, "Applicants"). 21 (Dkt. No. 36.) The court notes that as of the date of this order, 22 no opposition to the application has been filed. 23 This action was initially filed as an Americans with 24 Disabilities Act complaint against several defendants, including 25 Applicants and Cross Claimant Big 5 Corporation ("Big 5"). 26 Applicants and Big 5 subsequently filed cross claims against each 27 other. All of Plaintiff's claims have been resolved. Thus, only	8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11 SANDI RUSH, Case No. CV 10-04635 DDP (MANx) 12 Plaintiff, ORDER DISMISSING CASE 13 v. 14 W.K.S. RESTAURANT CORPORATION dba EL POLLO beCO NO. 177 BIG 5 CORP. dba BIG 5 SPORTING GOODS #400; [Docket NO. 36] 16 et al. . 17 Defendants. . 18 Presently before the court is the Ex Parte Application to 19 Dismiss Case filed by Defendants/Cross Claimants Rubio Holdings, 20 LLC and Crystal Enterprises, LLC (collectively, "Applicants"). 21 (Dkt. No. 36.) The court notes that as of the date of this order, 22 no opposition to the application has been filed. 23 This action was initially filed as an Americans with 24 Disabilities Act complaint against several defendants, including 25 Applicants and Cross Claimant Big 5 Corporation ("Big 5"). 26 Applicants and Big 5 subsequently filed cross claims against each 27 other. All of Plaintiff's claims have been resolved. Thus, only	9	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12 Plaintiff, ORDER DISMISSING CASE 13 v. 14 W.K.S. RESTAURANT CORPORATION dba EL POLLO HOCO NO. 177 BIG 5 CORP. dba BIG 5 SPORTING GOODS #400; [Docket NO. 36] 16 et al. Defendants. 17	10	
13 v. 14 W.K.S. RESTAURANT CORPORATION dba EL POLLO boco NO. 177 BIG 5 CORP. dba BIG 5 SPORTING GOODS #400; [Docket NO. 36] et al. 16 et al. 17	11	SANDI RUSH,) Case No. CV 10-04635 DDP (MANx)
<pre>14 14 W.K.S. RESTAURANT CORPORATION dba EL POLLO 15 16 COO NO. 17; BIG 5 CORP. dba BIG 5 SPORTING GOODS #400;) [Docket NO. 36] et al</pre>	12	
<pre>15 GORPORATION dba EL POLLO) 15 GORPORATION dba EL POLLO) 16 GORPORATION dba EL POLLO) 17 GORPORATION dba EL POLLO) 18 BIG 5 SPORTING GOODS #400;) [Docket NO. 36] 16 et al) 17</pre>	13	v.)
BIG 5 SPORTING GOODS #400;) [Docket NO. 36] et al.) Defendants.)		
Defendants.) 17		BIG 5 SPORTING GOODS #400;) [Docket NO. 36]
Presently before the court is the Ex Parte Application to Dismiss Case filed by Defendants/Cross Claimants Rubio Holdings, LLC and Crystal Enterprises, LLC (collectively, "Applicants"). (Dkt. No. 36.) The court notes that as of the date of this order, no opposition to the application has been filed. This action was initially filed as an Americans with Disabilities Act complaint against several defendants, including Applicants and Cross Claimant Big 5 Corporation ("Big 5"). Applicants and Big 5 subsequently filed cross claims against each other. All of Plaintiff's claims have been resolved. Thus, only		
19 Dismiss Case filed by Defendants/Cross Claimants Rubio Holdings, 20 LLC and Crystal Enterprises, LLC (collectively, "Applicants"). 21 (Dkt. No. 36.) The court notes that as of the date of this order, 22 no opposition to the application has been filed. 23 This action was initially filed as an Americans with 24 Disabilities Act complaint against several defendants, including 25 Applicants and Cross Claimant Big 5 Corporation ("Big 5"). 26 Applicants and Big 5 subsequently filed cross claims against each 27 other. All of Plaintiff's claims have been resolved. Thus, only		Dresently before the court is the Ex Darte Application to
20 LLC and Crystal Enterprises, LLC (collectively, "Applicants"). 21 (Dkt. No. 36.) The court notes that as of the date of this order, 22 no opposition to the application has been filed. 23 This action was initially filed as an Americans with 24 Disabilities Act complaint against several defendants, including 25 Applicants and Cross Claimant Big 5 Corporation ("Big 5"). 26 Applicants and Big 5 subsequently filed cross claims against each 27 other. All of Plaintiff's claims have been resolved. Thus, only		
 (Dkt. No. 36.) The court notes that as of the date of this order, no opposition to the application has been filed. This action was initially filed as an Americans with Disabilities Act complaint against several defendants, including Applicants and Cross Claimant Big 5 Corporation ("Big 5"). Applicants and Big 5 subsequently filed cross claims against each other. All of Plaintiff's claims have been resolved. Thus, only 		
no opposition to the application has been filed. This action was initially filed as an Americans with Disabilities Act complaint against several defendants, including Applicants and Cross Claimant Big 5 Corporation ("Big 5"). Applicants and Big 5 subsequently filed cross claims against each other. All of Plaintiff's claims have been resolved. Thus, only		
This action was initially filed as an Americans with Disabilities Act complaint against several defendants, including Applicants and Cross Claimant Big 5 Corporation ("Big 5"). Applicants and Big 5 subsequently filed cross claims against each other. All of Plaintiff's claims have been resolved. Thus, only		
25 Applicants and Cross Claimant Big 5 Corporation ("Big 5"). 26 Applicants and Big 5 subsequently filed cross claims against each 27 other. All of Plaintiff's claims have been resolved. Thus, only	23	
26 Applicants and Big 5 subsequently filed cross claims against each 27 other. All of Plaintiff's claims have been resolved. Thus, only	24	Disabilities Act complaint against several defendants, including
27 other. All of Plaintiff's claims have been resolved. Thus, only	25	Applicants and Cross Claimant Big 5 Corporation ("Big 5").
	26	Applicants and Big 5 subsequently filed cross claims against each
28 the cross claims remain.	27	other. All of Plaintiff's claims have been resolved. Thus, only
	28	the cross claims remain.

1	All of the cross claims concern interpretation of a lease
2	under state law. No federal questions remain. The amount in
3	controversy is less than \$13,000. Accordingly, the court declines
4	to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the remaining state law
5	claims. See 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c)(3); <u>Ove v. Gwinn</u> , 264 F.3d 817, 826
6	(9th Cir. 2001) ("A court may decline to exercise supplemental
7	jurisdiction over related state-law claims once it has dismissed
8	all claims over which it has original jurisdiction."). Applicants'
9	Motion to Dismiss is GRANTED. All cross-claims are dismissed
10	without prejudice. ¹
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	IT IS SO ORDERED.
16	
17	A Russia
18	Dated: October 4, 2011 DEAN D. PREGERSON
19	United States District Judge
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	¹ The court notes that equitable tolling may apply to any
28	potential statute of limitations issues.
	2