

1 After conducting a de novo review of the case, including a review of the magistrate
2 judge's findings and recommendations (ECF No. 190), the supplemental Muñoz declaration (ECF
3 No. 185), and the Muñoz declaration as to costs (ECF No. 165-2), the court notes two arithmetic
4 errors: one in the calculation of fees, and one in the calculation of costs.

5 The court concludes the magistrate judge intended to award \$24,929.50 in fees. *Compare*
6 ECF No. 190 at 14-16 (individual sums totaling \$24,929.50 in fees), *with id.* at 2, 16
7 (recommending award of \$24,629.50 in fees); *see generally* Muñoz Suppl. Decl., ECF No. 185.
8 Additionally, the court concludes the magistrate judge intended to award \$2,978.67 in costs.
9 *Compare* ECF No. 190 at 2, 16 (recommending award of \$2,987.67 in costs), *with* Muñoz Decl. ¶
10 20 (individual sums totaling \$2,978.67 in costs, consistent with overall request).

11 The court also notes two typographical errors that do not affect the analysis reflected in
12 the findings and recommendations: The date of the *Wages v. I.R.S.* decision cited at page 13,
13 lines 13-14, should be 1990, not 1992. And the year identified at page 15, line 17, should read
14 2016, not 2017.

15 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that attorneys' fees in the amount of \$24,929.50
16 and costs in the amount of \$2,978.67 are awarded to defendant Hornbrook and against plaintiff.

17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 DATED: July 24, 2018.

19
20 
21 _____
22 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
23
24
25
26
27
28