

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No.: CV 25-05340-ODW (RAOx) Date: February 4, 2026
Title: Matthew R. Walsh v. Rokoko Electronics et al.

Present: The Honorable **ROZELLA A. OLIVER, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Eddie Ramirez
Deputy Clerk

Tape No.: CS 2/4/2026
Court Recorder: CourtSmart System

Attorneys Present for Plaintiff(s):

Attorneys Present for Defendant(s):

Matthew R. Walsh, pro se

Katherine Ellena

**Proceedings: MINUTES OF ZOOM HEARING AND ORDER RE: MOTIONS
[85][117][121][130]**

The case was called for hearing by Zoom. Plaintiff and counsel for Defendant made their video appearances. The Court and the parties discussed the pending discovery-related motions, the parties' IDC request, and the upcoming settlement.

I. Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration (Dkt. No. 85)

Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration is denied. The Court finds that none of the grounds for reconsideration are met. *See* L.R. 7-18. The Court struck the parties' cross-motions regarding the subpoenas at issue for failure to meet and confer in good faith. *See* Dkt. No. 83. It was apparent during the hearing that the parties have not yet met and conferred in good faith on the subpoenas.

II. Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions (Dkt. No. 117)

As stated on the record, Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions is denied without prejudice as premature with respect to the discovery-related issues.

III. Defendant's Motion to Compel (Dkt. No. 121)

Defendant's Motion to Compel is granted to the extent that Plaintiff will be required to respond to the discovery requests at issue.¹ The Court will not deem Plaintiff's objections waived. Defendant agreed to correct the numbering of its Requests for Production ("RFPs") and re-serve them on Plaintiff. Plaintiff's responses shall be due within 30 days of Defendant re-serving the

¹ The Court finds that the declaration filed by defense counsel satisfies Local Rule 37-2.4 and thus Defendant was excused from filing a joint stipulation.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No.: CV 25-05340-ODW (RAOx) Date: February 4, 2026
Title: Matthew R. Walsh v. Rokoko Electronics et al.

RFPs on Plaintiff. The Court did not observe any numbering issues with the interrogatories. Plaintiff's response to the interrogatories shall be due within 30 days of the date of this order.

IV. Plaintiff's Motion for Admissions (Dkt. No. 130)

Plaintiff's Motion for Admissions is denied without prejudice for failure to comply with L.R. 37-1 and 37-2.

V. IDC Request

The parties requested an informal discovery conference ("IDC") regarding their dispute over a protective order and an ESI protocol. As to a protective order, Defendant agreed to re-circulate its proposed protective order that is based on the Court's template protective order. Plaintiff is directed to review the circulated protective order. If Plaintiff agrees to it, Defendant shall file the stipulated protective order by **February 6, 2026**.

As to the ESI protocol, the parties are ordered to meet and confer. Based on Defendant's representation that it has sent Plaintiff a redlined version of Plaintiff's proposed ESI protocol, Plaintiff is directed to review Defendant's modifications so that the parties may meet and confer and work on a compromise. The Court directs the parties to begin their meet and confer as soon as practicable and to complete their meet and confer efforts by **February 18, 2026**. The parties shall file either their stipulated ESI protocol or their respective proposed versions by **February 20, 2026**. To the extent the parties file their own proposed versions, they may concurrently file a short brief, no longer than 5 pages each, in support.

VI. Future Discovery Disputes

The Court imposes a pre-filing restriction for any future discovery-related motions that are to be considered by the undersigned. To the extent the parties remain at an impasse after good faith and robust meet and confer efforts, they may either request an IDC using the Court's IDC form, or they may request leave to file a discovery motion by emailing the Court at RAO_Chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov. In either situation, the parties must describe their meet and confer efforts to date. To the extent it appears that the parties have not exhausted their meet and confer efforts, the Court may require further meet and confer before holding an IDC or permitting discovery motion practice.

///

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No.: CV 25-05340-ODW (RAOx) Date: February 4, 2026
Title: Matthew R. Walsh v. Rokoko Electronics et al.

VII. Upcoming Settlement Conference

A settlement conference by Zoom remains on calendar for March 9, 2026 at 10 a.m. *See* Dkt. No. 112. Confidential settlement conference statements are due by March 2, 2026, and shall be emailed to the Court as set forth in the December 18, 2025 order. *See id.* After reviewing the statements, the Court may reach out *ex parte* to each side by telephone prior to the date of the settlement conference.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Initials of Preparer 0 : 54
er