

1
2
3
4
5 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
6 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
7

8 **JOSE ACOSTA,**

9 **Plaintiff**

10 **v.**

11 **ALONZO FAVIO RUIZ, JR. d/b/a**
12 **Ventura Tire Shop, et al.,**

13 **Defendants**

CASE NO. 1:17-CV-0230 AWI SKO

**ORDER DENYING APPLICATION FOR
STAY UNDER CALIFORNIA CIVIL
CODE § 55.54**

(Doc. No. 10)

14
15 This is a disability discrimination lawsuit that alleges claims under the Americans with
16 Disabilities Act (“ADA”) (42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq.), the California Unruh Civil Rights Act (Cal.
17 Civ. Code § 51 et seq.), and the California Health and Safety Code § 19955 et seq. Currently
18 before the Court is Defendant J.L. Marquez Properties, LLC’s application for a stay pursuant to
19 California Civil Code § 55.54 (“§ 55.54”).

20 Under California law, the Construction-Related Accessibility Standards Compliance Act
21 (Cal. Civ. Code §§ 55.51-55.54) “entitles some defendants in construction-related accessibility
22 suits to a stay and [an early] evaluation conference for the lawsuit.” O’Campo v. Chico Mall, LP,
23 758 F.Supp.2d 976, 983 (E.D. Cal. 2010). However, courts in this Ninth Circuit have held that
24 § 55.54’s stay and early evaluation provisions are preempted by the ADA. See Johnson v. GDRR
25 Props., LLC, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 176156, *2 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 20, 2016); Owens v. Ishihara-
26 Liang, Inc., 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 59511, *2 (E.D. Cal. May 4, 2016); Daubert v. City of
27 Lindsay, 37 F.Supp.3d 1168, 1179-80 (E.D. Cal. 2014); O’Campo, 758 F.Supp.2d at 985. Further,
28 courts in the Ninth Circuit have found, pursuant to *Erie R.R. Co. v. Tompkins*, 304 U.S. 64 (1938),

1 that federal courts should not apply § 55.54 to supplemental state law claims because that statute's
2 provisions are not outcome determinative. See Johnson, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 176156 at *2-*3;
3 Owens, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 59511 at *2; Daubert, 37 F.Supp.3d at 1180; O'Campo, 758
4 F.Supp.2d at 985. In light of this law, Defendant's application will be denied. See id.

5
6 ORDER

7 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendant's application for a stay pursuant
8 to California Civil Code § 55.54 (Doc. No. 10) is DENIED.

9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 Dated: April 11, 2017

11 
12 _____
13 SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28