

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  
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 ERRATA RE:  
DEFENDANT’S NON-OPPOSITION  
TO PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR  
RECONSIDERATION OF  
PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO  
COMPEL**

**TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES, AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD,**  
**PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that Plaintiff respectfully submits this Notice of Errata regarding the Plaintiff’s Notice of Defendant's Non-Opposition, Docket #87, filed on November 4, 2025, purely in the interest of judicial economy and reflection of an accurate record. The corrected filing is provided herein as EXHIBIT A, titled:

1 “NOTICE OF DEFENDANT’S NON-OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF’S MOTION  
2 FOR RECONSIDERATION OF PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO COMPEL.”  
3

4  
5 **SUMMARY OF CHANGES**  
6

- 7 1. Corrected spelling, grammar, formatting and punctuation issues throughout.
- 8 2. Corrected an erroneous date of when Plaintiff’s reply brief was due
- 9 3. Nothing substantive has been changed.
- 10 4. No new arguments have been introduced.
- 11 5. No new caselaw has been introduced.
- 12
- 13
- 14

15 Executed this 4th day of November, 2025, in Santa Clarita, California.  
16

17  
18   
19

20 Matthew R. Walsh  
21 Plaintiff In Pro Per  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**EXHIBIT A**

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 TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES, AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:  
11 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE: Plaintiff Matthew R. Walsh files this Notice with  
12 respect to his pending MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION, filed on October 27,  
13 2025 (Dkt #85). To date, Defendant has not filed an opposition or written  
14 statement that they will or will not oppose the motion (as required by L.R. 7-9).  
15 Defendant received the Plaintiff’s filings through the CM/ECF system on October

16 27, 2025, and as such, the opposition was due on November 3, 2025, per L.R. 7-9.  
17 Defendant has not opposed it within the period allowed; nor had they discussed it  
18 during the 26(f), 7-3 and 37-1 combined meet and confers which occurred on  
19 October 30, 2025.

20 Local Rule 7-9 specifically requires:

21 A) That the opposing brief be **filed at least twenty-one (21) days before**  
22 **the hearing.**

23 B) That Plaintiff's reply brief be filed 14 days before the hearing.

24  
25 Further, Plaintiff's reply to any filed opposition is **due fourteen (14) days**  
26 **prior to the hearing, which has now passed as of November 3, 2025.** It is with  
27 continuous frustration that Defendants outright refuse to follow the most basic  
28 Local Rules and have failed nearly every Court-issued deadline. Even if the  
29 Defendant filed an opposition today, the Plaintiff would suffer prejudice in losing  
30 critical time from the reply brief timeline. Not only should Defendant not be  
31 rewarded for again breaking the rules but given Plaintiff's extremely packed  
32 calendar this month, this would cause extreme hardship to Plaintiff who has  
33 already had to endure countless missed deadlines, delays, refusals and stonewalling  
34 from Defendant in this matter as detailed in the Motion for Reconsideration (Dkt  
35 #85), Motion for Sanctions (Dkt #73) and the Motion for Compel (Dkt #80).

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

47 Respectfully submitted,

48

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

50



Matthew R. Walsh  
Plaintiff In Pro Per

51