

1 **WO**

2

3

4

5

6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

8

9

Gisela E. Armado,

)

No. CV 10-1630-PHX-JAT

10

Plaintiff,

)

ORDER

11

vs.

)

12

Advanced Call Center Technologies,

)

13

Defendant.

)

14

15

16

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion for relief from the taxation of costs.

17

On May 14, 2012, Defendant filed a Bill of Costs. Doc. 50. Plaintiff had 14 days to file objections. Local Rule Civil 54.1(b). Plaintiff did not file any objections. The Clerk of the Court taxed costs on June 4, 2012. Doc. 51. Plaintiff had 7 days to file a motion for review with the District Court. Local Rule Civil 54.1 (b). Plaintiff did not file within 7 days, and by operation of the Local Rule, the taxation judgment became final on June 12, 2012.

22

Plaintiff filed the currently pending motion on July 27, 2012. The Court will deny the motion because it is untimely. Alternatively, the Court denies the motion because the Court does not find a basis for setting aside the taxation judgment for the substantive reasons provided in Defendant's response (Doc. 53.). Therefore,

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

IT IS ORDERED that the Motion for Relief Awarded Taxation of Costs (Doc. 52) is denied.

DATED this 9th day of October, 2012.



James A. Teilborg
United States District Judge