1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	
11	DAVID K. MEHL and LOK T. LAU, No. 2:03-cv-02682-MCE
12	Plaintiffs,
13	v. Order
14	LOU BLANAS et al.,
15	Defendants.
16	00000
17	In the instant case, Judgment was entered in favor of
18	Defendants and against Plaintiffs on February 5, 2008. Defendants
19	submitted their Bill of Costs, with an attached itemized list of
20	expenses (ECF No. 171) in compliance with Eastern District of
21	California Local Rule ("Local Rule") 292(c) on February 12, 2008
22	( <u>See</u> ECF No. 171). Plaintiffs had ten (10) days from the date of
23	filing of the Bill of Costs to object. No objections were filed.
24	The Clerk taxed and entered costs on March 4, 2008 and gave
25	electronic notice of same on March 4, 2008. ( <u>See</u> ECF No. 173).
26	Local Rule 292(e) provides that the Court may review the taxed
27	costs provided that a motion is filed within five (5) court days
28	following the notice from the Clerk.

1

1	Five (5) court days following March 4, 2008 was March 11, 2008.
2	Plaintiffs did not file their objections within the requisite time
3	period but rather on March 14, 2008 (See ECF No. 178). Plaintiffs'
4	objections were untimely and therefore stricken.
5	Plaintiffs are ordered to pay Defendants' Costs in the amount
6	of \$5,873.22.
7	IT IS SO ORDERED.
8	DATE: March 9, 2011
9	11 DE
10	Monte and the te
11	MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR. UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	