

1  
2  
3  
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
6

7 MATTHEW MORRIS,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE  
11 CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, et  
al.,

12 Defendants.

Case No. [23-cv-04562-HSG](#)


**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

Re: Dkt. No. 46

13  
14 Given that it declines to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state claims, the  
15 Court **ORDERS** Defendants to show cause why the case should not be remanded in light of  
16 Plaintiff's Amended Complaint, which proceeds only against non-federal defendants and asserts  
17 only state law causes of action.<sup>1</sup> See Dkt. No. 46. Defendants must file their response (no more  
18 than five pages in length) by May 23, 2024. Defendants' deadline to answer or oppose Plaintiff's  
19 Amended Complaint is **STAYED** until further notice.

20 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

21 Dated: May 9, 2024

22   
23 HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.  
24 United States District Judge

25  
26  
27 <sup>1</sup> While the Amended Complaint's Eighteenth Cause of Action, for "improper disclosure of  
28 health/medical information," references "Civ. Code § 56.20, HIPAA," the Court does not construe  
the reference to "HIPAA" as an assertion of a federal law violation, as it previously dismissed any  
federal HIPAA claim with prejudice. It instead understands Plaintiff to sue under California state  
provisions that, like HIPAA, limit disclosure of patients' health information.