

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: December 8, 2025  
Hearing Time: 1:30 PM*

**DECLARATION OF MATTHEW R.  
WALSH ISO MOTION FOR  
ENTRY OF DEFAULT re: INVALID  
CASELAW**

8  
9

10 I, Matthew R. Walsh, declare: All of the information set forth herein is based on  
11 my personal knowledge. If called to testify and be sworn as a witness, I could and  
12 would competently testify thereto.

13

14 **DEFENDANT AGAIN, IN OPPOSITION FOR ENTRY OF DEFAULT;**

15 **MISLEADS THE COURT WITH MORE FALSE CASELAW:**

16 Defense repeatedly submits caselaw which is either not precedent, is fabricated  
17 from AI generation, is misquoted or misattributed, does not say what they claim, or  
18 outright supports Plaintiff's position. Defendant's latest manipulation of truth is no  
19 exception:

20  
21 **1. Defendant's citation (Docket #96, Page #4, Line 17):** [*"See Harper v. City*  
22 *of Monterey, 519 F. App'x 503, 503 (9th Cir. 2013) (affirming denial of*  
23 *request for default where defendant had filed motion to dismiss)."*]

24 **a. What the caselaw actually says:**

25 **i. LEGAL NULLITY:** *"This disposition is not appropriate for*  
26 *publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir.*  
27 *R. 36-3."*

28 **ii.** Further, the affirmation to not enter default was upheld because  
29 *"Harper's contentions regarding personal jurisdiction and*  
30 *venue are unpersuasive. Harper's pending motions for judicial*  
31 *notice and entry of default are denied."*

32 **iii.** This order and affirmation has nothing to do with entry of  
33 default due to failure to plead OR failure to otherwise defend,  
34 but instead was entirely seeking entry of default over a  
35 jurisdictional and venue battle which the Court specifically

36 stated: “We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We  
37 review de novo, *Manzarek v. St. Paul Fire & Marine Ins. Co.*,  
38 519 F.3d 1025, 1030 (9th Cir. 2008), and we affirm”

39  
40 2. **Defendant’s citation (Docket #96, Page #4, Line 20):** [“*Nathan v. Fry’s*  
41 *Elecs., Inc.*, 607 F. App’x 623, 624 (9th Cir. 2015) (affirming denial of a  
42 motion for default where motion to dismiss was filed before clerk acted on  
43 request for entry of default);”]

44 a. **What the caselaw actually says:**

45 i. **LEGAL NULLITY:** “This disposition is not appropriate for  
46 publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir.  
47 R. 36-3”

48 ii. “Accordingly, we **affirm** the district court’s dismissal of  
49 *Nathan’s complaint*”

50 iii. “The district court’s entry of judgment for the defendants is  
51 **AFFIRMED.**”

52 iv. The affirmation does the opposite of what Defendant states it  
53 does.  
54

55 **3. Defendant’s citation (Docket #96, Page 4, Line 22):** [*“see also United*  
56 *States v. Boyce, 148 F. Supp. 2d. 1069, 1093 (S.D. Cal. 2001) (default*  
57 *judgement is not a “matter of right; rather, a court has discretion as to*  
58 *whether it should be granted.”)”]*

59 **a. What the caselaw actually says:**

60 i. *“Moreover, a consideration of the merits of this motion*  
61 *warrants entry of default judgment.”*

62 ii. *“Accordingly, the Government's motion for default judgment*  
63 *against the Trust and Northern Plains Service that they are the*  
64 *alter egos or nominees of the Boyces is GRANTED.”*

65 iii. *“ORDER: (1) GRANTING THE GOVERNMENT'S RENEWED*  
66 *MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND ENTRY OF*  
67 *JUDGMENT ON THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION;”*

68 iv. *“The Court finds that Rule 54(b) certification is proper“*

69 v. The affirmation does the opposite of what Defendant states it  
70 does.

71  
72 **4. Defendant’s citation (Docket #96, Page 5, Line 5) :** [*“Furthermore, Clerks*  
73 *may only enter default against parties who have never appeared in the*  
74 *action. See Direct Mail Specialists, Inc. v. Eclat Computerized*

75 *Technologies, Inc.*, 840 F.2d 685 (9th Cir. 1988). If a defendant has  
76 appeared, default entered by the clerk is void *ab initio*. *Id.* In general, “an  
77 appearance in an action involves some presentation or submission to the  
78 court. *Id.* at 698. But because judgments by default are disfavored, a court  
79 usually will try to find that there has been an appearance by defendant.”  
80 *Id.*”]

81 **a. What the caselaw actually says:**

82 i. [“For these reasons, we do not believe that the district court  
83 abused its discretion by refusing to vacate the default  
84 judgment.”]

85 **ii. The Entry of Default and Default Judgment was **AFFIRMED**.**

86 Defendant’s use of this caselaw as an argument is invalid and  
87 inapplicable and even goes on to find [*“In this case, the*  
88 *defendant's actions did not demonstrate "a clear purpose to*  
89 *defend the suit." Id.*”]; Precisely what Plaintiff declares about  
90 Defendant here.

91 **iii. The affirmation does the opposite of what Defendant states it**  
92 **does.**

93  
94 **CONCLUSION**

95 Every one of Defendant's cases are entirely inapplicable to their situation,  
96 cannot be used as president and outright do nothing for their opposition, rather, it  
97 bolsters Plaintiff's argument further.

98

99 Defendant's opposition does not supply:

- 100 1. A single citation of valid, applicable caselaw to support their  
101 argument(s) and;
- 102 2. A single piece of evidence in opposition (required by L.R. 7-9)  
103 and;
- 104 3. A single rebuttal of any specific claim Plaintiff made as required  
105 by L.R. 7-9 "*a statement of all the reasons in opposition thereto*"
- 106 4. A single declaration

107

108 It is not Plaintiff's duty to act as Defendant's paralegal. Yet, Plaintiff continually  
109 must expend time and resources to review their documents and [in]validate their  
110 caselaw or accept their manipulations and fabrications onto the record and allow  
111 the judicial machine to be compromised by their artificial productions. Their  
112 opposition must be disregarded as unsubstantive, defective, utterly lacking and  
113 wholly improper under L.R. 7-9. Plaintiff's motion for Entry of Default must be  
114 granted.

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

117

118 Respectfully submitted,

119 Dated this November 21, 2025, in Santa Clarita, California.

120

121

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Matthew R. Walsh", is written over a horizontal line.

Matthew R. Walsh  
Plaintiff In Pro Per

122