

1 MATTHEW R. WALSH  
2 19197 GOLDEN VALLEY RD #333  
3 SANTA CLARITA, CA 91387  
4 (661) 644-0012

5 Plaintiff In Pro Per,

6 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
7 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

MATTHEW R. WALSH

Case No.: 2:25-CV-05340-ODW-RAO

Plaintiff In Pro Per,

Before: Hon. Otis D. Wright II  
Courtroom 5D

vs.

ROKOKO ELECTRONICS  
(AND DOES 1 THROUGH 50,  
INCLUSIVE)

Hearing Date: December 22, 2025  
Hearing Time: 1:30 PM

Defendant

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND  
MOTION TO EXTEND PAGE  
LIMITATIONS FOR MOTION FOR  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

8  
9 TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES, AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF  
10 RECORD: PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on December 22, 2025, at 1:30 p.m., or  
11 as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard before the Honorable Otis D. Wright  
12 II in Courtroom 5D, Plaintiff Matthew R. Walsh will and hereby does move the  
13 Court for an order granting leave to file an oversized brief in support of his  
14 forthcoming Motion for Summary Judgment.  
15

16 **CERTIFICATION OF MEET AND CONFER**

17 Pursuant to L.R. 7-3, Plaintiff submits the accompanying declaration  
18 establishing that a the parties have met and conferred on October 30, 2025; a notice  
19 of that meeting was filed upon the Court (Dkt #86). Both parties discussed at  
20 length the motion, Defendant did not state if they would oppose but were  
21 concerned with the content and authorities of the motion. The Parties could not  
22 resolve the issues at hand as Defense wants a dismissal, Plaintiff wants a judgment.  
23 Defendant is aware of the page Count as Plaintiff sent them a screen shot.

---

24 **I. INTRODUCTION**

25 Plaintiff respectfully requests leave to file a Memorandum of Points and  
26 Authorities not to exceed \_\_ pages in support of his forthcoming Motion for  
27 Summary Judgment. Given the number of causes of action, the volume of  
28 admissions under Fed. R. Civ. P. 36(a)(3), and the procedural history of this  
29 matter, additional pages are necessary to present the issues clearly and assist the  
30 Court.

---

31 **II. BACKGROUND**

32 On October 30, 2025 Plaintiff, in order to comply in good with 26(f), 37-1,  
33 and 7-3; held a multi-topic conference with Defendant after the Court was made  
34 aware that they missed all deadlines for the aforementioned. During this meeting,  
35 as described in (Dkt #86); Plaintiff discussed at length the Motion for Summary

36 Judgment. During this time, Plaintiff attempted to settle the matter yet again, and  
37 issued a formal settlement letter which was to be answered by November 17, 2025.  
38 Defendant's stated in several Court documents that they were considering  
39 settlement, however, Defendant missed the deadline to accept or decline and is still  
40 putting forth no good faith efforts to settle the matter. Therefore, Plaintiff is  
41 moving for Summary Judgment.

---

42  
43 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

44  
45 **III. LEGAL STANDARD**

46 There is no specific rule governing motions to extend page or word  
47 limits. Courts have broad discretion to manage their docket and may  
48 modify page/word limits upon a showing of good cause (FRCP 1). The  
49 Court's inherent authority and its Scheduling Order authorize the Court  
50 to modify procedural requirements.

---

51  
52 **IV. ARGUMENT**

53 **1. INCREASED PAGE LIMITS NEEDED**

54 Plaintiff requests that the Court permit an increased limit sufficient  
55 above those in L.R. 11-6 to address all fourteen (14) causes of action

56 including alter-ego and RICO claims, which despite Defendant's  
57 continued contentions – were in fact plead at the Complaint stage.

58 i. RICO (Compl. Page 64, Line 115, ¶ 96)

59 ii. Alter-Ego (Compl. Page 58, Line 19, ¶ 84-92, ¶ 122)

60 2. **L.R. 11-6 NECESSITY AND GOOD CAUSE EXISTS**

61 3. Good cause exists under Local Rule 11-6. Plaintiff intends to bring a  
62 summary judgment motion on all causes of action, extensive Rule 36  
63 admissions, and voluminous undisputed material facts. A strict 25-  
64 page limit cannot adequately present the issues without prejudicing  
65 Plaintiff's ability to provide the Court with a clear, organized record:

66 i. **Legal Standards** are 9 pages and 1,724 words

67 ii. **Argument Section** - is approximately 46 pages and 7,936  
68 words. Respectfully, this is only 172 words per page; designed  
69 in a compliant way for the Court to easily digest while each  
70 prong is satisfied in a structured way (per ODW's Scheduling  
71 and Case Management Standing Order)

72 iii. The formalities of the motion make up for the remaining pages  
73

74

75 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF:.**

76

77 Plaintiff requests that the Court extend the page and word limitations and allow  
78 approximately a 61 page motion to be filed (absent any additional formal  
79 requirements the Court may deem necessary to include in the motion body).

80

81 For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court grant this  
82 Motion. Respectfully submitted,

83

84 Executed this November 25, 2025, in Santa Clarita, California.

85



86

87

88

Matthew R. Walsh  
Plaintiff in pro per