

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: November 24, 2025
Hearing time: 1:30PM

**NOTICE OF DEFENDANT’S
NONOPPOSITION TO
PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO FOR
RECONSIDERATION re:
PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO
COMPEL**

8
9
10
11
12
13

NOTICE OF DEFENDANT’S NONOPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF’S
MOTION TO FOR RECONSIDERATION
re: PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO COMPEL

14 Plaintiff Matthew R. Walsh files this Notice with respect to its pending
15 MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION, filed on October 27, 2025 (Dkt #85). To

16 date, Defendant has not filed an opposition or written statement that they will not
17 oppose the motion (as required by L.R. 7-9). At present, Defendant has offered no
18 opposition to Plaintiff's Motion. Defendant received the Plaintiff's filings through
19 the CM/ECF system on October 27, 2025, and as such, the opposition was due on
20 November 3, 2025, per L.R. 7-9. Defendant has not opposed it within the period
21 allowed.

22
23 Local Rule 7-9 allows 10 days for the filing of a responsive brief and
24 requires that the opposing brief be **filed at least twenty-one (21) days before the**
25 **hearing**. Even if the Defendant were to file today, the Plaintiff would suffer
26 prejudice due to the delay; as he has for over 50 days due to Defendant's delays.
27 Further, Plaintiff's reply to any filed opposition is due fourteen (14) days prior to
28 the hearing, on August 6, 2012. If the Defendant filed an opposition today, the
29 Plaintiff would suffer prejudice in losing critical time from the reply brief timeline.
30 L.R. 7-9. Given the Plaintiff and extremely packed calendar this month, this would
31 cause extreme hardship to Plaintiff who has already had to endure countless missed
32 deadlines, delays, refusals and stonewalling from Defendant in this matter.

33
34 Under the Local Rules and 9th Circuit law, a party's failure to timely oppose
35 a motion constitutes the non-moving party's consent to granting of the motion.

36 U.S. v. Warren, 601 F.2d 471, 474 (9th Cir. 1979); Righthaven LLC v. Newman,
37 Case No. 2:10-cv-01762, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 80518 (D. Nev. July 22, 2011)
38 (granting motion to dismiss due to plaintiff's failure, by a matter of mere hours, to
39 timely respond), aff'd on mtn. to reconsider, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 109327 (D.
40 Nev. Sept. 23, 2011); under Local Rule 7-12, this failure to oppose Plaintiff's
41 Motion means that *Defendant* "may be deemed to consent to the granting ... of the
42 *motion.*" For the above reasons, as well as those set forth in the Motion for
43 Reconsideration (Dkt #85), Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court consider
44 the Motion to be consented to and grant it in full.

45
46

47 Respectfully submitted,

48 Dated this November 4, 2025, in Santa Clarita, California.

49

50 

Matthew R. Walsh
Plaintiff In Pro Per

51