

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

Plaintiff In Pro Per,

vs.

ROKOKO ELECTRONICS  
(AND DOES 1 THROUGH 50,  
INCLUSIVE)

Defendant

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

*[Assigned to Hon. Rozella A. Oliver,  
Courtroom 590]*

Hearing date: February 4, 2026  
Hearing time: 10:00AM

**NOTICE OF DEFENDANT’S  
NONOPPOSITION TO  
PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR  
SANCTIONS**

8 **TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES, AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:**  
9

10 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE:** Plaintiff Matthew R. Walsh files this Notice with  
11 respect to his pending MOTION FOR SANCTIONS (Dkt #117), filed on  
12 December 29, 2025. To date, Defendant has not filed an opposition or written  
13 statement that they will or will not oppose the motion (as required by L.R. 7-12).  
14 Defendant received the Plaintiff’s filings through the CM/ECF system on  
15 December 29, 2025, and as such, the opposition was due before January 14, 2026,

16 per L.R. 7-9. Defendant has not opposed it within the period allowed and has  
17 waived their right to do so.

18 //

19 Local Rule 7-9 specifically requires:

20 A) That the opposing brief be **filed at least twenty-one (21) days before**  
21 **the hearing.**

22 B) That Plaintiff's reply brief be filed 14 days before the hearing.

23 //

24 Local Rule 7-12 states [ "*The failure to file any required document, or the failure to*  
25 *file it within the deadline, may be deemed consent to the granting or denial of the*  
26 *motion*"]. The court may deem any failure to oppose Plaintiff's motion for  
27 terminating sanctions as a waiver, and recommend that the motion be granted on  
28 that basis; a decision often affirmed [ "*The public's interest in expeditious*  
29 *resolution of litigation always favors dismissal*"] id. (quoting *Yourish v. California*  
30 *Amplifier*, 191 F.3d 983, 990 (9th Cir. 1999)). This is the second motion  
31 Defendants have failed to oppose and the second motion for sanctions which  
32 requested identical relief – terminating sanctions. The consequence of no  
33 opposition comes at no surprise, mistake or inadvertence.

34 [ "*A party's failure to timely oppose a motion constitutes the non-moving*  
35 *party's consent to granting of the motion.*"] (U.S. v. Warren, 601 F.2d 471, 474

36 (9th Cir. 1979)); Righthaven LLC v. Newman, Case No. 2:10-cv-01762, 2011 U.S.  
37 Dist. LEXIS 80518 (D. Nev. July 22, 2011) (**granting motion to dismiss due to**  
38 **plaintiff's failure, by a matter of mere hours, to timely respond**), **aff'd on mtn.**  
39 **to reconsider**, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 109327 (D. Nev. Sept. 23, 2011); Moreover,  
40 failure to follow a district court's local rules is a proper grounds for termination of  
41 or from the action (U.S. v. Warren, 601 F.2d 471, 474 (9th Cir. 1979)), which is  
42 what *both* motions for sanctions sought as relief.

43 Accordingly, the motion stands unopposed, and should be granted without  
44 requiring Plaintiff to incur the further expense of appearing for oral argument.

45

46

Dated this January 13, 2026, in Santa Clarita, California.

47



Matthew R. Walsh, Plaintiff In Pro Per

48