Julie Cloney should not be apportioned to Plaintiff because Ms. Cloney is not admitted to the

28

Doc. 44

California Bar, and she has not requested to represent Defendant in this matter on a pro hoc vice basis. Plaintiff's counsel also asserts that the hourly rate of \$335 for Defendant's counsel Christopher Yoo is unreasonable.

There is no requirement under Rule 37(a)(5)(C) that the Court apportion to Plaintiff *all* of Defendant's expenses in bringing the motion. *Compare* Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(5)(A) (where motion granted, court "must . . . require the party or deponent whose conduct necessitated the motion . . . to pay the movant's reasonable expenses incurred in making the motion . . . ") *with* Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(5)(C) (if the motion is granted in part, the court may "apportion the reasonable expenses for the motion"). Mr. Yoo states that he spent 2.1 hours preparing the discovery motion at issue. Given his hourly rate of \$335, the expenses related to his work amount to \$703.50. The Court finds that Plaintiff should be apportioned \$500 of these expenses. (*See* Doc. 31.)

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37(a)(5)(C), within 21 days from the date of this order, Plaintiff shall pay to Defendant the sum of \$500 as an apportionment of the expenses associated with Defendant's Motion for Discovery.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: <u>March 22, 2011</u>

/s/ Sheila K. Oberto
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE