

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

-----oo0oo-----

CONNIE CHERRONE, RICARDO
DOMINGUEZ, DENISE ELLIS,
THOMAS HOOVER, HAZEL
SARMIENTO, THELMA KNIGHTON,
HENRY KNIGHTON, VICENT MACIAS,
SHAHANNY MACIAS, TRAVIS
MARTIN, KATIE MARTIN, DUC TAN
NGUYEN, STEPHEN ORTEGA, DALE
RISENHOOVER, KRISTA REGO, and
JARED STERRITT,

NO. CIV. 2:12-02069 WBS CKD

ORDER

Plaintiffs,

v.

FLORSHEIM DEVELOPMENT, a
California Corporation;
FLORSHEIM PROPERTIES, a
California Corporation; ROSE
PETALS, LLC, a California
Limited Liability Company;
ROSE PARK, LLC, a California
Limited Liability Company; and
DOES 1-300 inclusive,

Defendants.

_____ /

-----oo0oo-----

Judgment was entered in favor of defendants, (Docket

1 No. 30), and defendants submitted a bill of costs for \$774.24 in
2 copying fees, (Docket No. 33). Plaintiffs have not objected to
3 the costs pursuant to Eastern District Local Rule 292(c). See
4 Stanley v. Univ. of S. Cal., 178 F.3d 1069, 1079 (9th Cir. 1999)
5 (“[Federal Rule of Civil Procedure] 54(d) creates a presumption
6 in favor of awarding costs to prevailing parties, and it is
7 incumbent upon the losing party to demonstrate why the costs
8 should not be awarded.”)

9 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(1) and Local Rule
10 292(f) govern the taxation of costs to losing parties, which are
11 generally subject to limits set under 28 U.S.C. § 1920. See 28
12 U.S.C. § 1920 (enumerating taxable costs); Fed. R. Civ. P.
13 54(d)(1) (“Unless a federal statute, these rules, or a court
14 order provides otherwise, costs--other than attorney’s fees--
15 should be allowed to the prevailing party.”); E.D. Cal. Local R.
16 292(f). Reviewing the submitted exhibit and considering that
17 courts have awarded copying fees in similar cases, the court
18 finds defendants’ bill of costs appropriate under the
19 circumstances. See e.g., Haagen-Dazs Co., Inc. v. Double Rainbow
20 Gourmet Ice Creams, Inc., 920 F.2d 587, 588 (1990).

21 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that costs of \$774.24 be taxed
22 against plaintiffs in favor of defendants.

23 DATED: June 1, 2013

24 

25 WILLIAM B. SHUBB
26 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
27
28