1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	00000
11	
12	J & J PUMPS, INC., a NO. CIV. 2:11-599 WBS CMK California corporation,
13	Plaintiff, ORDER RE: COSTS
14	V.
15 16	STAR INSURANCE COMPANY, a
16 17	Michigan corporation; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,
17	Defendants.
19	/
20	00000
21	On June 9, 2011, the clerk entered final judgment in
22	favor of defendant pursuant to the Court's Order granting
23	defendant's motion to dismiss the Complaint in its entirety.
24	(Docket Nos. 24-25.) Defendant submitted a cost bill totaling
25	\$476.80, (Docket No. 26), to which plaintiff has not filed any
26	objections.
27	Rule 54(d)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure
28	and Local Rule 292 govern the taxation of costs to losing
	1

parties, which are generally subject to limits set under 28 1 2 U.S.C. § 1920. See 28 U.S.C. § 1920 (enumerating taxable costs); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(d)(1) ("Unless a federal statute, these rules, 3 or a court order provides otherwise, costs--other than attorney's 4 fees--should be allowed to the prevailing party."); Local R. 5 292(f); Crawford Fitting Co. v. J.T. Gibbons, Inc., 482 U.S. 437, 6 441 (1987) (limiting taxable costs to those enumerated in § 7 1920). 8

9 The court exercises its discretion in determining 10 whether to allow certain costs. See Amarel v. Connell, 102 F.3d 1494, 1523 (9th Cir. 1996) (holding that the district court has 11 discretion to determine what constitutes a taxable cost within 12 the meaning of § 1920); Alflex Corp. v. Underwriters Labs., Inc., 13 914 F.2d 175, 177 (9th Cir. 1990) (same). The losing party has 14 15 the burden of overcoming the presumption in favor of awarding costs to the prevailing party. See Russian River Watershed Prot. 16 17 Comm. v. City of Santa Rosa, 142 F.3d 1136, 1144 (9th Cir. 1998) 18 (noting that the presumption "may only be overcome by pointing to some impropriety on the part of the prevailing party"); Amarel, 19 20 102 F.3d at 1523; see also Local R. 292(d) ("If no objection is 21 filed, the Clerk shall proceed to tax and enter costs.").

22 Plaintiff has not filed any objections. After 23 reviewing the bill of costs, the court finds the following costs to be reasonable: 24 Fees of the Clerk: 25 \$350.00 26 Fees for printed or electronically 27 recorded transcripts necessarily obtained 28 for use in the case: \$18.00

2

1	Fees for exemplification and the costs
2	of making copies of any materials where
3	the copies are necessarily obtained for
4	use in the case: \$88.80
5	Docket fees under 28 U.S.C. § 1923: \$20.00
6	Total: \$476.80
7	Accordingly, costs of \$476.80 will be allowed.
8	IT IS SO ORDERED.
9	Dated: July 29, 2011
10	1
11	million of Shibt
12	WILLIAM B. SHUBB UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	3