

RUSSELL ROPE
ID 1607 POB 1198
Sacramento, CA 95812
310-663-7655
justice@russellrope.com
In Pro Per

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

RUSSELL ROPE,

Plaintiff,

v.

COINBASE, INC. & DOES 1-20,

Defendants.

Case No.: 25STCV16692

**NOTICE OF OBJECTION &
REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION /
MODIFICATION**

Hearing Date of Ex Parte: October 2, 2025

Dept: 28 – Hon. Rupert A. Byrdsong

TO THE COURT & ALL PARTIES:

Plaintiff Russell Rope, appearing in pro per, respectfully objects to and seeks clarification of the Ex Parte Order entered on October 2, 2025, which granted Defendant Coinbase, Inc.’s application for a stay of proceedings until November 26, 2025.

1 **I. GROUNDS**

2 Claims involving fraud, misrepresentation, wrongful deprivation of access, or malicious
3 interference with property are not subject to private arbitration, and no stay may be used to
4 conceal or delay investigation into criminal conduct. Any construction of the Terms of Service
5 cannot override California’s strong public interest in adjudicating claims sounding in fraud, false
6 statements, and malicious interference.
7

8
9 To date, Defendant has not specifically denied any allegation of fraud, misrepresentation,
10 tampering, asset deprivation, stalking, or criminal interference raised by Plaintiff. Silence is not a
11 defense.
12

13
14 **A. Timely Opposition Filed:**

15 Plaintiff filed and served his Opposition, Declaration, and Proof of Service on October 1, 2025
16 — before the hearing time on October 2. It is unclear whether the Court considered this
17 opposition before ruling from chambers.
18

19
20 **B. Plaintiff’s Emergency, Not Defendant’s:**

21 Ex parte relief requires a showing of urgency and irreparable harm (CRC 3.1202(c); People v.
22 Superior Court (Lavi) (1993) 4 Cal.4th 1164, 1171). Plaintiff is the party suffering ongoing
23 irreparable harm — not limited to daily financial damages from frozen assets, continued hacking,
24 stalking, and two incidents of swatting — all documented in his filings. These harms compound
25 with each day of delay.
26
27
28

1 **C. Prejudice from Stay & CMC Continuance:**

2 The stay halts Plaintiff's discovery and motions that were properly served before Defendant
3 noticed its ex parte. Plaintiff also received no prior notice that the October 8 Case Management
4 Conference would be vacated and continued to November 26. This compounds prejudice and
5 undermines Plaintiff's ability to protect his rights and safety.
6

7
8 Additionally, the core issues in this case involve allegations of fraud, misrepresentation,
9 wrongful deprivation of access, and malicious interference with property — categories of claims
10 that California courts consistently hold are not subject to private arbitration.
11

12
13 **II. REQUESTED RELIEF**

14 Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court:

- 15 1. Confirm whether Plaintiff's October 1 Opposition was considered;
16 2. Clarify the status of the October 8 CMC; and
17 3. Modify the stay order as necessary to protect Plaintiff's rights and safety, including
18 allowing limited discovery and/or advancement of hearings to an earlier date than
19 November 26, 2025.
20
21

22 **III. CONCLUSION**

23
24 To date, Defendant has not specifically denied any allegation of fraud, misrepresentation,
25 tampering, asset deprivation, stalking, or criminal interference raised by Plaintiff. Silence is not a
26 defense. Plaintiff is the victim of ongoing misconduct and is suffering accruing damages and
27 safety risks. The true emergency lies with Plaintiff, not Defendants. Plaintiff respectfully asks the
28

1 Court to revisit the October 2 order to ensure that urgent harms are addressed now, rather than
2 leaving them unremedied until later. Discovery must proceed in this court.
3

4
5 Respectfully submitted,

6 Dated: November 12, 2025

7 /s/ Russell Rope
8 *Plaintiff In Pro Per*
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28