

- 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

JAMES ARMSTRONG et al,
Plaintiffs,

v

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
and DOES 1-50,

Defendants.

No C 01-2611 VRW

26
27
28

1 On May 18, 2009, the court ordered plaintiff Connie L
2 Brown to show cause why defendant CCSF's motion for attorneys' fees
3 should not be granted. Brown was warned that if she failed to
4 respond to the order, the court would grant the motion. Doc #139
5 at 3. Brown did not respond to the order, and the deadline for
6 doing so has passed.

7 An award of attorneys' fees is appropriate in settlement
8 enforcement actions. See TNT Marketing, Inc v Simon, 796 F2d 276,
9 278-79 (9th Cir 1986). Accordingly, the court GRANTS Doc #136 at
10 7, CCSF's motion for attorneys' fees in the amount of \$1,360.
11 Unless the parties otherwise agree, Brown shall pay CCSF \$1,360
12 within thirty days from the date of this order.

13
14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15
16 

17 VAUGHN R WALKER
18 United States District Chief Judge
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28