

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 CHRIS LANGER,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 WADIE P. DEDDEH, in individual and  
15 representative capacity as trustee of the  
16 WM Deddeh Family Trust dated January  
3, 2003 et al.,

17 Defendants.  
18

Case No.: 19-cv-1879-CAB-AGS

**ORDER DECLINING  
SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION  
OVER STATE LAW CLAIM**

19 The complaint in this action asserts one claim under federal law for violation of the  
20 Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”), along with a claim for violation of California’s  
21 Unruh Act. The complaint asserts jurisdiction based on the existence of a federal question  
22 (the ADA claim), and supplemental jurisdiction over the state claim.

23 Federal courts have the discretion to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over all  
24 claims that are “so related to claims in the action within such original jurisdiction that they  
25 form part of the same case or controversy under Article III of the United States  
26 Constitution.” 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a). Even if supplemental jurisdiction exists, however,  
27 district courts may decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over a claim if: (1) it raises  
28 a novel or complex issue of state law; (2) it substantially predominates over the claim(s)

1 over which the court has original jurisdiction; (3) the court has dismissed all claims over  
2 which it has original jurisdiction; or (4) there are other compelling reasons for declining  
3 jurisdiction. 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c). The Supreme Court has identified additional factors that  
4 district courts should consider when deciding whether to exercise supplemental  
5 jurisdiction, “including the circumstances of the particular case, the nature of the state law  
6 claims, the character of the governing state law, and the relationship between the state and  
7 federal claims.” *City of Chicago v. Int’l Coll. of Surgeons*, 522 U.S. 156, 173 (1997).

8 “While discretion to decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over state law  
9 claims is triggered by the presence of one of the conditions in § 1367(c), it is informed by  
10 the *Gibbs*<sup>1</sup> values ‘of economy, convenience, fairness, and comity.’” *Acri v. Varian*  
11 *Assocs., Inc.*, 114 F.3d 999, 1001 (9th Cir. 1997) (en banc) (citations omitted). A district  
12 court need not “articulate why the circumstances of [the] case are exceptional” to dismiss  
13 state-law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. section 1367(c)(1)-(3). *San Pedro Hotel Co., Inc.*  
14 *v. City of L.A.*, 159 F.3d 470, 478–79 (9th Cir. 1998) (citation omitted).

15 Here, the complaint states a federal claim for violation of the ADA, along with a  
16 state law claim for violation of the Unruh Act. As a result, while the ADA does not entitle  
17 a plaintiff to recover damages, the complaint seeks statutory damages under the Unruh Act.  
18 Meanwhile, the same injunctive relief available under the ADA is also available under the  
19 Unruh Act. *See Schutza v. Cuddeback*, 262 F. Supp. 3d 1025, 1031 (S.D. Cal. 2017)  
20 (noting that “[i]t is unclear what advantage—other than avoiding state-imposed pleading  
21 requirements—Plaintiff gains by being in federal court since his sole remedy under the  
22 ADA is injunctive relief, which is also available under the Unruh Act.”). Thus, the state  
23 claim and the issues related thereto substantially predominate over the ADA claim, which  
24 appears to be a secondary claim included to justify filing the complaint in this Court, rather  
25 than a necessary (let alone predominant) claim in this lawsuit. *See Rutherford v. Ara*

---

26  
27  
28 <sup>1</sup> *United Mine Workers of Am. v. Gibbs*, 383 U.S. 715 (1966).

1 *Lebanese Grill*, No. 18-CV-01497-AJB-WVG, 2019 WL 1057919, at \*3 (S.D. Cal. Mar.  
2 6, 2019) (declining supplemental jurisdiction over Unruh Act claim because Unruh Act  
3 claim substantially predominated over ADA claim).

4 In addition, the important interest of comity supports declining jurisdiction. *See*  
5 *United Mine Workers v. Gibbs*, 383 U.S. 715, 726 (1966) (holding that comity is a factor  
6 to be considered before exercising supplemental jurisdiction). California has a strong  
7 interest in protecting its citizens and businesses from abusive litigation and also in  
8 preventing its own laws from being misused for unjust purposes. In 2012, in an attempt to  
9 deter baseless claims and vexatious litigation, California adopted heightened pleading  
10 requirements for disability discrimination lawsuits under the Unruh Act. *See* Cal. Civ.  
11 Proc. Code § 425.50<sup>2</sup>; SB 1186, Chapter 383 § 24 (Ca. 2012). In 2019 alone, Mr. Langer  
12 has filed more than 50 disability discrimination cases in this court. Accordingly, the need  
13 for California’s procedural protections appears particularly acute.

14 Finally, “federal courts may properly take measures to discourage forum shopping.”  
15 *Rutherford v. Econolodge*, No. 18CV1471-LAB (JMA), 2019 WL 950329, at \*3 (S.D. Cal.  
16 Feb. 27, 2019) (citing *Hanna v. Plumer*, 380 U.S. 460, 467–68 (1965)); *Schutz v.*  
17 *Cuddeback*, 262 F. Supp. 3d at 1031 (holding that plaintiff who had filed numerous ADA  
18 actions in federal court was engaging in forum shopping “to avoid California’s heightened  
19 pleading requirements for disability discrimination claims.”). “[I]t would be improper to  
20 allow Plaintiff to use the federal court system as a loophole to evade California’s pleading  
21 requirements.” *Rutherford v. Ara Lebanese Grill*, 2019 WL 1057919, at \*5. “Therefore,  
22 as a matter of comity, and in deference to California’s substantial interest in discouraging  
23 unverified disability discrimination claims, the Court declines supplemental jurisdiction  
24

---

25  
26 <sup>2</sup> Under the Unruh Act a plaintiff alleging disability discrimination must include in his complaint: (1) an  
27 explanation of the specific access barrier or barriers encountered; (2) the way in which the barrier denied  
28 the individual full and equal access, or in which it deterred the individual on each particular occasion. (3)  
the date/s when the claimant encountered the specific barriers. The section also contains additional  
requirements for high-frequency litigants. Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 425.50.

1 over Plaintiff's [state law claims]." *Schutz v. Cuddeback*, 262 F. Supp. 3d at 1031.

2 In sum, because (1) Plaintiff's state law claim predominates over his federal claim  
3 under the ADA, and (2) the interests of comity and discouraging forum shopping constitute  
4 exceptional circumstances, the Court sua sponte declines supplemental jurisdiction over  
5 claim two in the complaint. Claim two is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** to  
6 refiling in state court.

7 It is **SO ORDERED**.

8 Dated: October 4, 2019



9  
10 Hon. Cathy Ann Bencivengo  
11 United States District Judge  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28