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

4
5
6
7

## SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

RUSSELL ROPE,

Plaintiff,

V.

COINBASE, INC. & DOES 1-20,
Defendants

Defendants

Case No.: 25STCV16692

EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR

EQUIVALENT RELIEF IN LIEU OF TRO

OR EMERGENCY PRESERVATION

ORDER; MEMORANDUM OF POINTS &

AUTHORITIES; DECLARATION OF

RUSSELL ROPE IN SUPPORT

Hearing Date: July 7, 2025; 8:30 AM Dept: 85

TO THE HONORABLE COURT

## AND TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff Russell Rope will and hereby does apply ex parte on July 7, 2025, at 8:30 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in Department 85 of the above-entitled Court located at 111 N. Hill Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012, for an order granting emergency equitable relief functionally equivalent to the relief sought in the Proposed TRO filed June 19, 2025, and partially granted on June 27, 2025.

Judge: Hon. James C. Chalfant

18 19

20

21 22

24

25

23

26

27 28 II. MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

Emergency equitable relief is warranted where a party faces irreparable harm, is likely to succeed on the merits, and where the balance of equities favors intervention. (See Robbins v. Superior Court (1985) 38 Cal.3d 199; Civ. Code § 3422; CCP § 526.)

Plaintiff's Verified Complaint alleges claims including conversion, fraud, and biometric coercion, supported by over 4,000 unlawfully held NFTs valued at over \$1 million. Coinbase has not disputed that the assets exist or that they control the wallet. The Court has already issued a preservation order. However, Coinbase continues to block access, ignore the preservation directive, and evade meaningful

cooperation.

The Court expressed concern on July 3, 2025, about factual distinctions in Plaintiff's prior filings and asked for clarification and new facts. Plaintiff's concurrently filed supplemental declaration provides those details, including clear technical explanations of why Coinbase's claimed engineering burden is fabricated and how they routinely execute such transfers under probate and regulatory procedures.

Crucially, Plaintiff emphasizes that return of assets takes precedence over mere preservation, and has made numerous good-faith requests for transfer. Coinbase has instead tried to redirect the Court's attention away from the core harm and mischaracterize Plaintiff's relief as premature or burdensome despite being able to manually comply with the Court's June 27 Order through root administrative actions.

Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court restore meaningful relief by compelling Coinbase to fulfill its custodial obligations, comply with legal process, and return Plaintiff's property without further delay.

## III. DECLARATION OF RUSSELL ROPE

- I, Russell Rope, declare as follows:
  - I am the Plaintiff in this matter. I have personally experienced the denial of access to my Web3
     Wallet since April 19, 2025, despite verifying my identity and making repeated good-faith requests for support.
  - The Court issued a preservation order on June 27, 2025. Coinbase did not object at the time.
     Instead, they later filed a bad-faith ex parte application attempting to dissolve that order without complying or providing technical basis for their opposition.
  - I have submitted a detailed supplemental declaration filed concurrently with this application that addresses the technical feasibility of asset transfer and account recovery, based on both my technical qualifications and publicly available information about Coinbase's custodial practices.
  - I am requesting immediate manual transfer of my assets using Coinbase's administrative
    capabilities, and that those assets be preserved and not altered or deleted until full transfer is
    complete and confirmed.

1	Coinbase's refusal has resulted in escalating and irreparable harm to my business ventures, brand
2	equity, and digital asset value, as further detailed in my declaration.
3	
4	
5	IV. CONCLUSION
6	For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court grant this revised ex parte
7	application based on new facts and enforce the June 27, 2025 order through affirmative relief.
8	Dated: July 6 <sup>th</sup> , 2025
10	/s/ Russell Rope
11	Plaintiff In Pro Per
12	
13	DDOOF OF SEDVICE
14	PROOF OF SERVICE Case No.: 25STCV16692
15	
16	I, Russell Rope, declare that on July 6, 2025, at 5:30 p.m. PDT, I served the foregoing <b>EX PARTE</b>
17	APPLICATION FOR EQUIVALENT RELIEF IN LIEU OF TRO OR EMERGENCY
18	PRESERVATION ORDER; MEMORANDUM OF POINTS & AUTHORITIES;
19	DECLARATION OF RUSSELL ROPE IN SUPPORT on Coinbase, Inc.'s counsel
20	(jackie.feick@nortonrosefulbright.com, eric.martin@nortonrosefulbright.com,
22	jeff.margulies@nortonrosefulbright.com) via email, pursuant to Cal. Code Civ. Proc. §1010.6 and Cal.
23	Rules of Court, Rule 2.251.I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of California that the
24	foregoing is true and correct.
25	Dated: July 6 <sup>th</sup> , 2025
26	
27	/ <mark>s/ Russell Rope</mark> Plaintiff In Pro Per
28	