

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ANGELA MADATOVIAN,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
BAYER HEALTHCARE LLC,  
Defendant.

Case No. 2:24-cv-10232-FLA (MAAx)

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY  
ACTION SHOULD NOT BE  
REMANDED FOR LACK OF  
EQUITABLE JURISDICTION**

1 **ORDER**

2 “In order to entertain a request for equitable relief, a district court must have  
3 equitable jurisdiction, which can only exist under federal common law if the plaintiff  
4 has no adequate legal remedy.” *Guzman v. Polaris Indus. Inc.*, 49 F.4th 1308, 1313  
5 (9th Cir. 2022) (citations omitted); *see also Guar. Tr. Co. of N.Y. v. York*, 326 U.S. 99,  
6 105 (1945) (equitable relief in federal courts is “subject to restrictions: the suit must  
7 be within the traditional scope of equity as historically evolved in the English Court of  
8 Chancery[;] a plain, adequate and complete remedy at law must be wanting[;] explicit  
9 Congressional curtailment of equity powers must be respected[; and] the constitutional  
10 right to trial by jury cannot be evaded[.]”) (citations omitted). “Even when a court has  
11 subject matter jurisdiction, there remains the question of equitable jurisdiction before  
12 the district court properly can reach the merits.” *Guzman*, 49 F.4th at 1314  
13 (capitalization modified) (internal quotation marks omitted) (citing *Schlesinger v.*  
14 *Councilman*, 420 U.S. 738, 754 (1975)). “That a State may authorize its courts to  
15 give equitable relief unhampered by the restriction that an adequate remedy at law be  
16 unavailable cannot remove that fetter from the federal courts.” *Sonner v. Premier*  
17 *Nutrition Corp.*, 971 F.3d 834, 839–44 (9th Cir. 2020) (cleaned up).

18 The court has reviewed the Complaint and is presently unable to conclude it has  
19 equitable jurisdiction. Dkt. 1, Ex. 1 (“Compl.”). The only claims asserted are brought  
20 under the California Unfair Competition Law (the “UCL”), Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code  
21 § 17200, *et seq.*, and remedies available under the UCL are equitable in nature, *Cel-*  
22 *Tech Commc’ns, Inc. v. Los Angeles Cellular Tel. Co.*, 20 Cal. 4th 163, 179 (1999);  
23 *Hodge v. Superior Ct.*, 145 Cal. App. 4th 278, 284 (2006) (the UCL “provides only  
24 for equitable remedies”). A remedy at law, however, appears adequate to address the  
25 alleged harm. *See* Compl. ¶¶ 1, 8–9 (defendant allegedly advertised falsely its  
26 vitamins were free of artificial flavors).

27 Accordingly, the parties are ORDERED to show cause, in writing within  
28 fourteen (14) days from the date of this Order, why this action should not be remanded

1 for lack of equitable jurisdiction because an adequate remedy at law exists. *See*  
2 *Guthrie v. Transamerica Life Ins. Co.*, 561 F. Supp. 3d 869, 871–80 (N.D. Cal. 2021)  
3 (remanding action for lack of equitable jurisdiction where plaintiff sought only  
4 restitution under the UCL). Responses shall be limited to 4,200 words. Failure to  
5 respond timely to this Order may result in remand of the action without further notice.

6  
7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8  
9 Dated: March 11, 2025

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  


---

FERNANDO L. AENLLE-ROCHA  
United States District Judge