

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
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RANDY DEWAYNE PITTMAN,
Plaintiff,
v.
LANDSPHERE PROPERTY
MANAGEMENT, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 25-cv-07705-PCP

ORDER DISMISSING CASE

United States District Court
Northern District of California


Pro se plaintiff Randy Dewayne Pittman filed this action against his landlord Landsphere Property Management and property manager Vamsi Musunuru alleging that they unlawfully failed to create an accessible parking space for Mr. Pittman at his apartment building. He asserts claims under the federal Fair Housing Act (FHA), 42 U.S.C. § 3604(f)(3); California’s Fair Employment and Housing Act, Cal. Gov’t Code §§ 12927, 12955; California Civil Code § 54.1; and California Code of Civil Procedure §§ 526 and 1060. Concurrent with his complaint, Mr. Pittman filed an application to proceed in forma pauperis, i.e., without paying the otherwise mandatory filing fee to initiate a lawsuit. The Court previously granted that application and, pursuant to 28 U.S.C § 1915(e)(2), screened Mr. Pittman’s complaint. *See* Dkt. No. 13. As the Court explained in that order, Mr. Pittman’s complaint fails to state a claim under the FHA. The Court therefore dismissed that claim with leave to amend. The Court also determined that the complaint fails to articulate an independent basis for this Court’s subject-matter jurisdiction over Mr. Pittman’s remaining state-law claims. Because the Court declined to exercise supplemental jurisdiction, the Court also dismissed those claims with leave to amend. The Court instructed Mr. Pittman that, if he failed to file an amended complaint by December 1, 2025, the Court would dismiss his case with prejudice.

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

Though the Court granted Mr. Pittman leave to amend, Mr. Pittman has not filed an amended complaint. For the reasons set forth in the Court’s previous order, the Court therefore dismisses the case. Dismissal of his federal FHA claim is with prejudice for failure to state a claim pursuant to 28 U.S.C § 1915(e)(2). *See Cato v. United States*, 70 F.3d 1103, 1106 (9th Cir. 1995). Because the Court declines to exercise jurisdiction over his remaining state-law claims, the dismissal of those claims is without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 29, 2025



P. Casey Pitts
United States District Judge

United States District Court
Northern District of California