

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
#1196  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL**

Case No. 2:25-cv-05340-ODW (RAOx) Date July 14, 2025

Title *Matthew R. Walsh v. Rokoko Electronics et al.*

Present: The Honorable Otis D. Wright, II, United States District Judge

Sheila English

Not reported

N/A

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter / Recorder

Tape No.

Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:

Attorneys Present for Defendants:

Not present

Not present

**Proceedings:**

**In Chambers**

Plaintiff Matthew R. Walsh, proceeding pro se, filed several documents with the Court. (ECF No. 37, 48, 49, 53.) The Court addresses each filing in turn below.

A. Motion to Strike (ECF Nos. 37.)

On June 17, 2025, Plaintiff filed a Motion to Strike Defendant’s Ex Parte Application. (ECF No. 37.) The Court previously denied Defendant’s Ex Parte Application. (Min. Order, ECF No. 24.) Accordingly, the Court **DENIES AS MOOT** Plaintiff’s Motion to Strike Defendant’s Ex Parte Application. (ECF No. 37.)

B. Ex Parte Application (ECF No. 48.)

On June 6, 2019, Plaintiff moved ex parte for the Court to stay the case and all briefing deadlines pending resolution of Plaintiff’s Motion to Strike. (Ex Parte Appl., ECF No. 48.) Defendant opposes ex parte relief and Plaintiff replied. (Opp’n, ECF No. 55; Reply, ECF No. 56.)

In *Mission Power Engineering Co. v. Continental Cas. Co.*, the Court provided the requirements a party must meet in order to obtain ex parte relief. 883 F. Supp. 488, 492 (C.D. Cal. 1995). Notably, the party seeking ex parte relief must establish why a motion cannot be calendared in a regular manner; that they will be irreparably prejudiced if motion is heard in accord with regular procedures; and that the requesting party is without fault in creating the crisis that requires ex parte relief or that the crisis was due to excusable neglect. *Id.* In this

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
#1197  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No.	2:25-cv-05340-ODW (RAOx)	Date	July 14, 2025
Title	<i>Matthew R. Walsh v. Rokoko Electronics et al.</i>		

Court’s local rules, the Court also provides that “[e]x parte applications are solely for extraordinary relief and should be used with discretion.”

The Court finds Plaintiff falls short of establishing prejudice as set forth in *Mission Power Engineering*. **Ex Parte Applications are reserved for extraordinary circumstances** and responding to timely-noticed motions do not generate the requisite prejudice required to justify ex parte relief. Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff’s Ex Parte Application. (ECF No. 48.) Plaintiff may not refile it.

C. Motion to Strike (ECF Nos. 49, 53.)

On July 3, 2025, Plaintiff filed two Motions to Strike. (ECF Nos. 49, 53.) As the motions appear to be identical and for clarity on the docket, the Court **STRIKES** the Motion filed at ECF No. 53. Plaintiff’s Motion to Strike fails to comply with Local Rule 7-4 as Plaintiff does not set a motion hearing date. Nevertheless, the Court hereby **SETS** the hearing on Plaintiff’s Motion to Strike on **August 18, 2025, at 1:30 p.m.** Opposition and reply papers are due pursuant to Local Rules 7-9 and 7-10.

D. Decorum

The Court notes that the parties appear to be unable to work collaboratively and follow Local Rules. Both sides accuse the other of refusing to substantively discuss the contemplated motions and any potential resolutions prior to filing motions, as required by Local Rules. (*See e.g.* Mot. Strike 19, ECF No. 49; Decl. Katherine Ellena ISO Mot. Dismiss ¶ 4, ECF No. 42-1.) Both sides also improperly use ex parte applications—which is reserved for extraordinary circumstances—as a mechanism to bypass noticed motion requirements. This has resulted in a congested docket with confusing and duplicative filings that are stricken for failure to comply with Local Rules.

The Court cautions the parties that they are expected to conduct themselves with civility and professionalism. All parties shall work together and coordinate their filings and actions as necessary so that the record of this case remains clean and organized. Further filings that fail to comply with applicable rules or that are otherwise inappropriate will be summarily stricken, and the Court will not hesitate to impose monetary sanctions in cases where the violations are particularly egregious or repeated.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL**

Case No.	2:25-cv-05340-ODW (RAOx)	Date	July 14, 2025
Title	<i>Matthew R. Walsh v. Rokoko Electronics et al.</i>		

The Court further reminds the parties to review the Local Civil Rules for the Central District of California before filing additional documents in this case. The Local Civil Rules can be found on the Court’s website under Court Procedures: <https://www.cacd.uscourts.gov/court-procedures/local-rules>. The Court also urges Plaintiff to review the Self-Representation Order the Court issued in this case on June 16, 2025. (ECF No. 11.) Plaintiff is “held to the same standards as a lawyer as far as complying with court procedures and the rules and regulations of the court system.” (*Id.* at 2.) Plaintiff is strongly advised to consult with an attorney or with the Federal Pro Se Clinic.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

\_\_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_\_ 00  
Initials of Preparer SE \_\_\_\_\_