

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. Otis D. Wright, II,  
Courtroom 5D; Hon. Rozella A. Oliver,  
Courtroom 590]*

Hearing Date: February 4, 2026  
Time: 10:00 a.m.  
Department/Judge: Hon. Oliver,  
Courtroom 590

**OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS  
MEMORANDUM ISO MOTION TO  
COMPEL**

8  
9 1. Defendant filed a “Supplemental Memorandum in Support of Motion  
10 to Compel” (ECF No. 134) after Plaintiff’s Opposition had been filed, and  
11 without authorization under the Local Rules or a Court order. This prevents  
12 Plaintiff from properly objecting to the contents thereof. Should Defendant  
13 wished to have it considered as part of the motion, it should have been filed

14 as part of the motion.

15  
16 **THE MEMORANDUM FILING IS WHOLLY DEFECTIVE AND**  
17 **IMPROPER**

18 2. Defendant's latest filing is a second MOTION TO COMPEL  
19 disguised as a memorandum. It makes legal argument, without Plaintiff's  
20 opportunity to substantively oppose or reply and seeks relief hidden in a  
21 CONCLUSION asking the Court to compel responses. This is improper.

22 3. Under Local Rules 7-9 and 7-10, motion practice permits the filing of  
23 a motion, an opposition, and a reply. The Local Rules do not authorize the  
24 filing of an additional memorandum responding to an opposition outside that  
25 sequence. Defendant's "Supplemental Memorandum" is therefore an  
26 unauthorized filing.

27 4. Pursuant to Local Rule 7-12, the Court may decline to consider any  
28 memorandum or other document not filed in compliance with the Local  
29 Rules. Defendant remains free to present rebuttal argument in a properly  
30 filed reply pursuant to Local Rule 7-10, but may not supplement the briefing  
31 through an extra memorandum not contemplated by the Rules.

33 **THE MOTION TO COMPEL IS ALSO DEFECTIVE AND MUST BE**  
34 **DENIED WITH PREJUDICE OR STRICKEN**

35 5. Defendant submitted their motion with no 37-1; as they do continually  
36 and were just ordered by the Court to withdraw for the same.

37 6. Defendants again file this disguised motion labeled as a memorandum  
38 also with no meet and confer or notice whatsoever as required by the Local  
39 Rules. Both filings must be disregarded entirely.

40  
41 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

42 Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court:

- 43
- 44 1. **DENY** Defendant's motion to compel (Dkt #121) **with prejudice** for  
45 misconduct and failure to meet and confer under L.R. 37-1.
  - 46 2. **STRIKE** Defendant's MEMORANDUM as it is a disguised motion (Dkt  
47 #134) for procedural impropriety and failure to meet and confer.
  - 48 3. **ORDER** Defendant's to show cause for why they refuse to comply with the  
49 Local Rules, refuse to simply correct the numbering to allow discovery and  
50 continually refuse to meet and confer before filing motions.
- 51

52 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the  
53 foregoing is true and correct.

54

55 Respectfully submitted,

56 Dated this January 21, 2026, in Santa Clarita, California.

57

58 

58

Matthew R. Walsh  
Plaintiff In Pro Per

59

60

61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73

**CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE**

The undersigned, counsel of record for Plaintiff appearing in pro per, certifies that this brief contains 1,371 words, which complies with the word limit of L.R. 11-6.2.

DATED: January 21, 2026



Matthew R. Walsh  
Plaintiff in pro per