




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

Plaintiff In Pro Per,

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MATTHEW R. WALSH
19197 GOLDEN VALLEY RD #333
SANTA CLARITA, CA 91387,

Plaintiff In Pro Per,

vs.

ROKOKO ELECTRONICS
(AND DOES 1 THROUGH 50, INCLUSIVE)
31416 AGOURA RD STE 118
WESTLAKE VILLAGE, CA
91361

Defendant

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

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

Hearing date: TBD
Hearing time: TBD

**PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF MOTION
AND MOTION TO STRIKE NOTICE OF
REMOVAL AND ALL RELATED
FILINGS**

Filed concurrently with:
- Memorandum of Points and Authorities
- Declarations of Matthew R. Walsh:
- (SET 1 Exhibits A through ZN), (SET2
Exhibits A through SET2-NR)
- [Proposed] Order granting motion to strike
- Request for judicial notice

PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF MOTION AND
MOTION TO STRIKE NOTICE OF REMOVAL AND ALL RELATED FILINGS

14 **NOTICE OF MOTION**

15
16 **TO THE HONORABLE COURT, THE CLERK OF THE COURT, AND ALL PARTIES**
17 **AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

18
19 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE:** that Plaintiff Matthew R. Walsh will and hereby
20 does move this Court to strike Defendant's Notice of Removal and all subsequent filings, in lieu
21 of filing a Motion to Remand, on the grounds that removal was improper, procedurally defective,
22 and obtained through misrepresentation among other causes.

23
24 This Motion is made following the conference of counsel pursuant to Local Rule 7-3, which took
25 place on June 19, 2025.

26
27 The Motion is based on this Notice of Motion, the accompanying Memorandum
28 of Points and Authorities, the concurrently filed Declaration of Matthew R. Walsh and attached
29 Exhibits, all pleadings and papers on file in this action, and any argument the Court may hear.

30
31
32 **CERTIFICATION OF CONFERENCE OF OPPOSING COUNSEL**

33
34 a.) This motion is made following the conference of counsel pursuant to L.R.

b.) 7-3 which took place on June 19, 2025. Submitted 7 days after Plaintiff met and conferred with Defendant on June 19, 2025 indicating his intention to strike the removal and on what grounds. Defendant indicated they would oppose.

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

a.) This is not a motion to remand. Plaintiff seeks a declaration that removal was procedurally null, based on fraud, false misrepresentations, procedural gamesmanship and filed by individuals with no legal standing to act as counsel. The appropriate remedy is to strike the removal entirely and vacate any filings tainted by unauthorized practice of law and improper conduct.

b.) Plaintiff respectfully moves to strike the Notice of Removal filed by Defendant, along with all subsequent federal filings, on the grounds that:

i. Defendant's removal was entirely improper under 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d) as it was based on false statements, made intentionally under penalty of perjury about corporate citizenship and;

56 ii. The Removal bears a signature of counsel whose name appears nowhere
57 else on the document and;

58
59 iii. The Removal bears only the name of an attorney who was not permitted to
60 practice law in California nor appear on this case as they did not have pro
61 hac vice status and;

62
63 iv. Defendant's attorneys were not properly licensed or authorized to appear
64 in this Court and even after being removed from the docket, continued the
65 unauthorized practice of law in communications with Plaintiff and
66 authoring of documents in which they were not authorized and;

67
68 v. Defendant's nerve center and domicile is in California, no individual
69 controlling member of Defendant Rokoko Electronics is an American
70 citizen and cannot claim diversity of citizenship and;

71
72 vi. Defendant omitted a Delaware LLC to the Court "Rokoko, LLC" which
73 makes them a citizen of every state and;

74
75 vii. Defendant has failed to conform with local rules on meet & confer
76 procedures prior to filing motions, especially on **Defendant's Motion To**

77 **Dismiss** (see Plaintiff's Request for Default) and further, the motions
78 themselves are noncompliant under Local Rule 7-3 and;
79

80 viii. Defendant has used the removal process in bad faith to delay adjudication
81 in state court and avoid a pending motion for summary judgment to which
82 they have not opposed.
83

84 c.) These actions as well as others constitute fraud on the court and violate Federal Rule
85 of Civil Procedure 11.
86

87 d.) Because this Court lacks subject-matter jurisdiction and removal was fundamentally
88 improper, Plaintiff respectfully asks the Court to strike the removal, strike all filings,
89 remand the case, and issue appropriate sanctions.
90
91

92
93
94 **STATEMENT OF SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS**
95

96 This motion is based on the attached Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the
97 concurrently filed Supplemental Declaration of Matthew R. Walsh and attached Exhibits
98 SET1-A through SET1-ZN and SET2-A through SET2-N, the complete Court record in this

case, and any evidence or argument presented at hearing.

II. LEGAL STANDARD

1. Newman-Green, Inc. v. Alfonzo-Larrain, 490 U.S. 826 (1989) -- Requires both U.S. citizenship and domicile in a state to qualify for diversity jurisdiction.
2. Kanter v. Warner-Lambert Co., 265 F.3d 853 (9th Cir. 2001) -- Defines domicile as a permanent home with intent to remain.
3. 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c) -- “If at any time before final judgment it appears the district court lacks subject matter jurisdiction, the case must be remanded.”
4. Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(b) -- Attorneys must ensure that any claims or legal contentions are warranted by law and fact.
5. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(f) -- The Court may strike any filing that is “redundant, immaterial, impertinent, or scandalous.”
6. Rules of Professional Conduct – Rule 5.5 & Rule 9.40 -- Governing unauthorized practice and requirements for pro hac vice in California.

121 7. CA Business & Professions Code §§ 6125 and 6126 -- Prohibit practicing law in
122 California without a license.

123
124 8. People ex rel. Dept. of Corporations v. Speedee Oil Change, 20 Cal.4th 1135
125 (1999), & Kirk v. First American Title Ins. Co., 183 Cal.App.4th 776 (2010) --
126 Address ethical violations and disqualification of counsel due to conflict or
127 unauthorized practice.

128
129 9. Local Rule 7-3 -- Requires parties to meet and confer at least 7 days before filing
130 most motions.

131
132 10. Local Rules on formatting: Signature block violations (L.R. 11-3.8 / 11-6(f)),
133 Incorrect line spacing (L.R. 11-3.6)

134
135 11. L.R. 83-2.1.1 & L.R. 83-2.1.4 -- Prohibit unauthorized practice of law by non-
136 admitted attorneys and require court approval before filing or appearing.

137
138 12. Pavelic & LeFlore v. Marvel Entertainment Group, 493 U.S. 120 (1989) --
139 Holding that signing and filing are nondelegable responsibilities, and violations
140 fall on the individual attorney.

13. Hertz Corp. v. Friend, 559 U.S. 77 (2010) -- “Nerve center” test determines a corporation’s principal place of business for jurisdictional purposes.

14. Courts have inherent authority to strike filings and impose sanctions when a party abuses the judicial process or commits fraud on the court

III. ARGUMENT

1. Removal Was Filed By Non-Attorney with False Signature

a.) Defendant was served the Complaint on or about April 17, 2025 and again on or about May 4, 2025 and then again on or about May 14th, 2025.

b.) Plaintiff filed a declaration of general appearance and numerous documents in state Court where Defendant ignored them and offered no response or opposition, even in Federal court until on or about June, 17, 2025

c.) Defendant removed this case on the 30th day after service by an attorney not licensed to practice law in the State of California, Michael Galibois; an Illinois attorney with no pro hac vice status (SET1 Exhibit Y).

d.) Michael Galibiois' did not procure pro hac vice status yet his name, and only his name is listed under Attorneys on the removal application (SET1 Exhibits Y, ZA). As 2090-1(b) States: "A court order is needed before the nonresident attorney is authorized to file any papers or appear at a court hearing on behalf of a client. ". No such order existed, and Michael had not applied yet filed for removal improperly and gained that removal illegally. **The removal is and void ab initio and should be stricken, not remanded.**

e.) Despite being listed as the sole attorney – Michael Galibois never signed the document his name appears on. Further, forensic metadata analysis of the document substantially demonstrates that the signature of Katherine J. Ellena was not placed by her, but instead, was placed by those unadmitted attorneys (SET2 Exhibits B, C). Attorneys cannot sign documents authored or completed by non-attorneys under Rule 11:

f.) **"The person signing, filing, submitting, or advocating a document has a nondelegable responsibility to the court,** and in most situations is the person to be sanctioned for a violation. Absent exceptional circumstances, a law firm is to be held also responsible when, as a result of a motion under subdivision (c)(1)(A), one of its **partners, associates,** or employees is determined to have violated the rule." (Cf. Pavelic & LeFlore v. Marvel Entertainment Group , 493 U.S. 120 (1989)) (taken from U.S. Court – Central District Website)

g.) Signing, authoring, filing or contacting clients as counsel is not allowed, even if signed by a local attorney as those powers are a nondelegable responsibility (P & L v. Marvel Entertainment | 493 U.S. 120 (1989)) which found: *“the purpose of Rule 11 as a whole is to bring home to the individual signer his personal, nondelegable responsibility. It is at least arguable that these purposes are better served by a provision which makes clear that, just as the court expects the signer personally -- and not some nameless person within his law firm -- to validate the truth and legal reasonableness of the papers filed”*

2. Removing Attorney Not Authorized To Appear Whatsoever

a.) Michael, his documents, nor his name is unauthorized to appear at all under L.R. 83-2.1.1 and L.R. 83-2.1.4. Any document filed by Michael such as the cover sheet and any other such documents prior to pro hac vice status must be stricken.

3. Defendant Used Unadmitted Attorneys, Filings Must Be Stricken

a.) Those individuals who were removed from docket and noticed for lack of pro hac vice status continued the unauthorized practice of law and engaged personally with Plaintiff after removal from docket and notification, issuing directives and making statements as if they were representative counsel. (SET1 Exhibits T, U, V)

b.) Those individuals who were removed from docket continued affixing their names to documents after removal under the legal nullity (*pro hac vice* forthcoming), instead of ceasing to participate as Counsel until approval by the Court (SET1 Exhibits X.1, X.2).

c.) The repeated appearance even after removal from the docket of attorneys with no *pro hac vice* status on filings (SET1 Exhibits X-Y), in communications with Plaintiff (SET1 Exhibits T, U, V, ZB, ZK-ZN), is cause for denial/striking of their applications under Rule 12(b): “*Absent special circumstances, repeated appearances by any person under this rule is a cause for denial of an application.*”

d.) Defendant’s removal was not based on a legitimate belief in jurisdiction, but rather on a strategy to run out the clock on state court deadlines.

4. Defendant Made Fraudulent Statements To Court to Justify Removal

a.) Defendant’s primary precursor for removal was that it was a foreign corporation headquartered outside California, and that diversity jurisdiction applied. Defendant knew this to be false. Defendant made this statement under penalty of perjury:

b.) “Rokoko’s principal place of business is located at Sankt Gertruds Stræde 10, 1129 København, Denmark, from where Rokoko’s senior executives direct, control, and coordinate the company’s primary business activities on a day-to-day basis” -- “At no


228 point prior to filing or at the time of filing was Rokoko a citizen of California.

229 Rokoko has only ever been a Delaware corporation with a principal place of business
230 in Denmark.” – “I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of
231 California and the United States that the foregoing is true and correct.”

232
233 c.) Plaintiff has demonstrated significantly through evidence that Defendant, and his
234 counsel knew this statement to always be false through the following evidence:
235

236 d.) The individuals who authored, signed and filed Federal pleadings on behalf of
237 Defendant were not admitted in the Central District of California and had no legal
238 right to appear and those documents are void ab initio (SET1 Exhibits T-ZA)
239

e.) The removing entity (“Rokoko Electronics”) is in fact a California citizen, with it’s principal place of business in California and meets the nerve test under Hertz v Friend (see diagram under Exhibit S) or inline:



5. Defendant and counsel purposely omitted key information to the Court that would definitively destroy diversity of citizenship:

a.) Defendant has a Delaware LLC of the same name, which makes the removing entity a citizen of every state. (SET1 Exhibit R) “Corporations are citizens of both their state of incorporation and the state in which they have their principal place of business.” 28

U.S.C. § 1332(c)(1); see also *New Alaska Dev. Corp. v. Guetschow*, 869 F.2d 1298, 1300-01 (9th Cir. 1989).

6. Defendant Has a History of Creating Inc and LLC identical structures

a.) This is not a mistake or accident, Defendant has many international shell companies which he similarly names, while creating two versions: an Inc. and LLC, he does the same in Denmark: ApS and IVS (SET1 Exhibit ZH).

b.) This is intentional concealment and a blatant fraudulent scheme to conceal and control jurisdiction, assets, and liability – intentionally creating domestic and foreign shell companies which have no business purpose beyond being a sword and a shield for both tax and liability purposes. Many of the international shells resolve to the exact same address as Defendant’s basement HQ. Ironically, the other controllers of the Company follow similar structures and entanglement into each others shell Companies (SET1 Exhibits ZI, ZJ).

7. No Diversity of Citizenship for Non-Americans

a.) More fatally, as Defense Counsel has always known, and as Plaintiff stated during meet and confer (Exhibit SET2-N), all of the named individual defendants are of non-citizen Danish national immigrant status. Under clear Supreme Court precedent, a natural person must be both a U.S. citizen and domiciled in a U.S. state to qualify for diversity jurisdiction. “[I]n order to be a citizen of a State within the meaning of the

272 *diversity statute, a natural person must both be a citizen of the United States and be*
273 *domiciled within the State.” — Newman-Green, Inc. v. Alfonzo-Larrain, 490 U.S.*
274 *826, 828 (1989).*

275
276 a.) None of the named Defendants have U.S. citizenship: Mikkel Overby lives in, and
277 has only ever lived in Denmark and is a Danish citizen and Jakob Balslev and Matias
278 Sondergaard are both Danish citizens as well, not American. Diversity jurisdiction is
279 dead on arrival.

280
281 **8. Defendant’s Company Was Founded In California**

282 a.) Its principal place of business (“nerve center”) is and always was San Francisco,
283 California; (SET1 Exhibits S, J, K, L-M, N, Q)

284
285 **9. Defendant’s Company was founded here (SET1 Exhibits A-A.1, D-F)**

286 a.) Defendant received investments (\$92M from Naver Z in Los Angeles) (SET1 Exhibit
287 I) for stake in ownership, and prize money (SET1 Exhibit G) at local events from
288 investors and companies which are California based while being domiciled here.

289
290 **10. Defendant Resides In And Is Domiciled In California**

291 a.) It’s owners, founders, board members and operators live and resided in San
292 Francisco, California; owned homes; raised families and had bank accounts. (SET1
293 Exhibits B, C, J, K, Q)

b.) Defendant's CEO is listed on the California business registration, at the apartment he moved from at 4140 Cesar Chavez St. Apt 54, San Francisco, CA 94131 (SET1 Exhibit NO)

c.) Defendant banks in California, with a Corporate account at Silicon Valley Bank (SET1 Exhibit Q) which was only 4.2m from his apartment (SET1 Exhibit NP)

11. Defendant's core customer base is located in California (SET1 Exhibit N)

a.) Defendant made express admissions which attest that the nerve center is San Francisco, California (SET1 Exhibits F, L-L.1, O): ["We're in San Francisco and just established our US subsidiary company with our new and very tall US lawyer David Raynor. It is VERY exciting! More updates from San Fran coming up" -- with Matias Søndergaard and Jakob Balslev.] (SET1 Exhibits Exhibit F)

b.) Under CCP 392-403 California Superior Court has jurisdiction. This is further reaffirmed in plain-text on the Court's website: "*In general, all California superior courts have jurisdiction over a person that lives in California or can be found in California, and businesses or organizations that do business in California. So, as long as you are suing someone who lives in California or a company or organization that does business here, the superior court has personal jurisdiction.*" --

<https://selfhelp.courts.ca.gov/jurisdiction-and-venue-where-file-case>

316
317 **12. Defendant Stated No Intention To Leave California**

318 a.) Defendant has made express admissions since 2016 that they had no intention to
319 return to Denmark, establishing domicile. (SET1 Exhibit R) in which Defendant
320 stated: “... *absolutely fantastic first day in SF. We’ve moved into our new home and*
321 *have no return ticket – shiiiit*” “*The crazy journey with Rokoko that started 2.5 years*
322 *ago has now turned up another gear...*”

323
324 b.) Defendants intention to not return, and instead to remain in San Francisco
325 permanently, satisfies the definition of domicile under Kanter v. Warner-Lambert
326 Co., 265 F.3d 853, 857 (9th Cir. 2001): “*A person’s domicile is her permanent home,*
327 *where she resides with the intention to remain or to which she intends to return. A*
328 *person residing in a given state is not necessarily domiciled there, and thus is not*
329 *necessarily a citizen of that state.*”

330
331 **13. Defendant Lied To The Danish Government Re: Nerve Center**

332 a.) As to demonstrate the pattern of deceit Plaintiff has continued claiming before this
333 very Court; On or about 2019, Defendant’s nerve center remained in San Francisco,
334 where operations, executive control, and decision-making were based. Nevertheless,
335 Defendant misrepresented this fact to the Danish government investment fund
336 Vækstfonden (SET1 Exhibits ZC, ZE), falsely portraying Denmark as the company’s

principal hub in order to secure a DKK 19 million (~\$2.93 million USD) capital investment.

b.) Once the investment round was completed, Defendant stuck a small “ROKOKO” sticker to the abandoned and gate-secured basement cellar he had rented as early as 2016 in which he calls his “Copenhagen HQ” (SET1 Exhibit ZF). Defendant, Mikkel Overby who was accused of making false statements to this Court stated to Plaintiff in writing:

“we do have offices (and the Copenhagen office is not in a basement”).

Yet, the majority of business statements and alter-ego shells point to that specific address which bears the name “ROKOKO” on the cellar door (Exhibit SET1-NT) and even further, private investigator images have revealed that the 400sqft basement is, in fact Defendant’s office – albeit empty, without staff and only 8 pieces of inventory (“Rokoko FaceCam’s”) inside. (Exhbit SET1-NS)

14. Defendants Motion To Dismiss as an Answer is Procedurally Invalid.

a.) (Fed. R. Civ. P. 55(a); Local Rule 55-1): Plaintiff further requests that the Court, in light of the procedural defect in Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss and failure to timely respond to the Complaint as ordered (Dkt. 25), enter default against Defendant pursuant to Rule 55(a).

b.) Defendant contacts Plaintiff only by e-mail and states their intention to file, then subsequently file within hours of that initial statement. (SET2 Exhibit O).

c.) Defendant has not engaged in any phone calls of any proper length to discuss the proposed motion as required by Rule 7-3 (“*The conference must take place in person, by telephone, or via video conference*”) and Plaintiff has asked Defendant to prove otherwise (SET2 Exhibit NR).

d.) Defendant’s counsel essentially admits they gave up on the meet and confer process, despite never truly participating (see Request for Entry of Default) in so far that they said: “*I am happy to **resume** the meet and confer discussion with you.*” stating they did so because “*you have stated you will oppose any motion we file*” (a manufactured statement submitted as hearsay by Counsel). And their belief that 7-3 does not apply to them due to this: “*We have met our meet and confer obligations*”. (SET2 Exhibit NR)

e.) Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. 42) contains numerous violations of local rules including L.R. 11-6.1 which requires “*no memorandum of points and authorities, pretrial brief, trial brief, or posttrial brief may exceed 7,000 words*” – and 11.6-2 “*The person preparing the certificate may rely on the word count of the word-processing system used to prepare the document*”. Defendant did not provide a word

count, they simply wrote “6999”; one less than the Courts limit; however, **the word count is actually 14,636 words making it non-compliant** and another knowingly false statement made by Defendant and their Counsel.

f.) The Clerk declined to enter default due to the presence of the procedurally defective Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. 42), but the Motion was filed in clear violation of Local Rule 7-3 and 11-6.1 and should not toll the responsive pleading deadline under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(a)(4).

g.) Should the Court grant Plaintiff’s Motion to Strike, Plaintiff respectfully requests that default be entered as of June 27, 2025, as Defendant failed to file a proper and timely responsive pleading.

IV. CONCLUSION

a.) The Defendant has procedurally defaulted in this matter by filing an improper motion to dismiss as an answer to the Complaint which violated rules 7-3 and 11-6.1, 11-6.2 and thus has not answered in the required time of this Court.

b.) This is not a case of confusion or a clerical error — Defendant deliberately misled this Court and Plaintiff, multiple times, as they did with each and every other Court and alternate dispute resolution process.

c.) Defendant in the state case, along with in the Complaint (Thirteenth Cause of Action); which is entirely a case about fraud, theft and deceit - has been accused of spoliating key evidence at very specific litigation-specific dates. The spoliation was demonstrated **with direct, live video evidence**, then evidence of Defendant attempting to undo the spoliation after the MSJ called it out, as if Defendant had a consciousness of guilt. These patterns by Defendant and their Counsel are systemic, not accidental.

d.) Defendant attempted to use federal removal procedures to frustrate justice. The Court has the authority and obligation to act decisively when a party engages in fraudulent and abusive conduct.

e.) Plaintiff should not be punished for following the law, while battling non-admitted out-of-state attorneys engaging in unfair practices; especially in a case subsequently about fraud, theft and deceit.

f.) This case never should have been removed to Federal Court in the first place. This wasn't justice, this was intentional manipulation by the Defendants and their counsel to avoid liability in a matter so clearly evidenced against them. They never had intentions to litigate the matter or resolve the dispute – they just wanted it to go away.

425 **V. REQUEST FOR RELIEF**

426 Plaintiff respectfully asks the Court to:

- 427
- 428 a.) Strike Defendant's Motion to Dismiss for L.R. 11.6 and L.R. 7-3 meet and confer
- 429 violations as it did with Plaintiff's motions and enter default for failure to respond in
- 430 a timely manner under Rule 55.
- 431
- 432 b.) Not to simply remand this case, but to Strike the Notice of Removal in its entirety.
- 433
- 434 c.) Strike all federal filings submitted by Defendant or their unauthorized representatives;
- 435
- 436 d.) Allow this case to be again heard by the California Superior Court immediately, but
- 437 without the legal protections offered by a standard remand with no tolling protections
- 438 to be available after.
- 439
- 440 e.) Award reasonable attorney's fees, actual costs and miscellaneous costs under 28
- 441 U.S.C. § 1447(c) to be determined upon Court request;
- 442
- 443 f.) Issue sanctions under Rule 11 or the Court's inherent powers to deter similar conduct
- 444 and punish the offenders.
- 445

g.) Disqualify ReedSmith (Defendant's Counsel) from counsel of record for all the
aforementioned and continuous unauthorized practice of law pursuant to Rules 5.5,
9.40, CA BPC § 6125, § 6126 and the inherent authority of the Court under (*People
ex rel. Dept. of Corporations v. Speedee Oil Change* (1999) 20 Cal.4th 1135, *Kirk v.
First American Title Ins. Co.* (2010) 183 Cal.App.4th 776)

Executed this 26 day of June, 2025 in Santa Clarita, California.



Matthew R. Walsh
matthew@winteryear.com
19197 Golden Valley Rd #333
Santa Clarita, CA 91387
(661) 644-0012
matthew@winteryear.com
Plaintiff in pro per

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

The undersigned,, counsel of record for Plaintiff appearing in pro per, certifies that this brief contains 3,617 words, which complies with the word limit of L.R. 11-6.2.

The memorandum of points and authorities is less than 10 pages in length and so does not require a table of contents in compliance with L.R. 11-8.

DATED: June 26, 2025



Matthew R. Walsh
Plaintiff in pro per

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Matthew R. Walsh, declare:

I am a resident of the State of California, over the age of eighteen years, and a party to this action. My business address is 19197 Golden Valley Rd #333, Santa Clarita, CA 91387.

On July 3, 2025, I served the following document(s):

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO STRIKE DEFENDANTS REMOVAL

☒ by transmitting a true copy via electronic mail to the following email address(es):

Reed Smith LLP (Counsel for Defendant)

Heather Valencia, Esq.

Hvalencia@reedsmith.com

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

Executed on July 3, 2025

Santa Clarita, California



Matthew R. Walsh
Plaintiff In Pro Per

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO STRIKE NOTICE OF
REMOVAL AND ALL RELATED FILINGS**

The Court, having reviewed and considered Plaintiff Matthew R. Walsh's Motion to Strike Defendant's Notice of Removal and all related filings, the accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the Declarations and Exhibits submitted in support, and all other evidence and argument presented, and good cause appearing:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. Plaintiff's Motion to Strike the Notice of Removal is GRANTED;
2. The Notice of Removal filed by Defendant is STRICKEN as procedurally defective and obtained through unauthorized practice of law;
3. The Motion to Dismiss is STRICKEN as procedurally defective.
4. All subsequent federal filings submitted by Defendant or their unadmitted counsel are STRICKEN;
5. This case is REMANDED to the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles;
6. The removal of this action is deemed void ab initio and did not toll any deadlines or procedural obligations in the underlying state court action.
7. Plaintiff may file a motion for attorney's fees, costs, or sanctions under 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c) and Rule 11 within 14 days.
8. Defendant's counsel Reed Smith LLP is DISQUALIFIED from further appearance in this matter.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: _____

Hon. Otis D. Wright II
United States District Judge