

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No.: CV 25-05340-ODW (RAOx) Date: July 2, 2026
Title: Matthew R. Walsh v. Rokoko Electronics et al.

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

Cindy Delgado
Deputy Clerk

N/A
Court Reporter/Recorder: N/A

Attorneys Present for Plaintiff(s):

Attorneys Present for Defendant(s):

N/A

N/A

Proceedings: (In Chambers) **ORDER RE: MOTIONS TO COMPEL [186][188] AND PLAINTIFF’S PENDING REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE DISCOVERY MOTION**

Pending before the Court are two motions to compel, which raise disputes in a joint table format as previously directed by the Court. Dkt. Nos. 183, 186-188. The Court noted that the motions would be taken under submission unless a hearing was necessary. *See* Dkt. No. 183.

On June 23, 2026, District Judge Wright issued an order dismissing Plaintiff’s first and third causes of action without leave to amend. Dkt. No. 197. Judge Wright also issued an Order to Show Cause (“OSC”) as to why the Court should not dismiss the remaining copyright claim for failure to state a claim. Dkt. No. 198. Following review of the parties’ responses, Judge Wright found that Plaintiff satisfied his burden under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). Dkt. No. 208. Thus, Plaintiff’s second cause of action for copyright infringement remains at issue.

Following the dismissal of the first and third causes of action, Plaintiff requested, by email, leave to submit a short supplemental filing removing requests and disputes that Plaintiff no longer seeks to pursue. Plaintiff also requested by email a brief conference or leave to file a motion regarding Defendant’s responses to certain RFAs that were re-propounded after the Court’s May 12, 2026 discovery order.

In light of the dismissal of two causes of action, the Court orders both sides to review their joint tables filed in support of their motions to compel and to remove any requests or disputes that are no longer at issue. The Court warns the parties that if the Court cannot ascertain relevance to the copyright claim for any requests that remain in the table, the Court will be inclined to deny the motion to compel as to those requests. With respect to Plaintiff’s request to file another discovery motion regarding re-propounded RFAs, the Court will permit Plaintiff to add those requests to the

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No.: CV 25-05340-ODW (RAOx) Date: July 2, 2026
 Title: Matthew R. Walsh v. Rokoko Electronics et al.

table for his motion to compel after providing Defendants the opportunity to provide their position. However, Plaintiff should only add requests if they are relevant to the remaining copyright claim. The parties shall re-file their joint tables in support of their respective motions to compel by **July 13, 2026**. The July 8, 2026 hearing is **VACATED** and the Court will take the motions to compel under submission after the parties re-file their joint tables.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Initials of Preparer _____ : _____
cd