

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

No. C-08-4990 EMC

Plaintiff,

v.

RESEARCH IN MOTION LIMITED, *et al.*

Defendants.

**ORDER (1) DENYING RIM'S MOTION  
FOR LEAVE TO FILE OPPOSITION TO  
OBJECTIONS TO RIM'S BILL OF  
COSTS; (2) DENYING MFORMATION  
TECHNOLOGIES, INC.'S MOTION  
FOR LEAVE TO FILE REPLY IN  
SUPPORT OF OBJECTIONS TO BILL  
OF COSTS; AND (3) DENYING AS  
MOOT MOTIONS TO FILE UNDER  
SEAL****(Docket Nos. 1093, 1094, 1096, 1105, 1106)**

On September 19, 2012, Defendants Research in Motion Limited and Research in Motion Corporation ("RIM") filed an administrative motion for leave to file an opposition to Plaintiff Mformation's objections to RIM's bill of costs. (Docket Nos. 1094, 1096.) Subsequently, Plaintiff Mformation filed an administrative motion for leave to file a reply brief in support of its objections to RIM's bill of costs on September 26, 2012. (Docket No. 1106.) The Clerk of Court taxed costs on October 16, 2012, rendering the parties' motions for leave to file an opposition and a reply moot. (Docket No. 1115.) Thus, the parties' motions for leave to file an opposition and a reply are **DENIED AS MOOT.**

In addition, neither the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure nor the Civil Local Rules provide for the filing of oppositions or replies to objections to bills of cost. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 54; N.D. Cal. Civ. R. 54. If any party seeks to appeal the Clerk's determination on RIM's bill of costs, it may do


1 so by motion served within seven days of the Clerk's taxing costs pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil  
2 Procedure 54(d)(1).

3 Simultaneously with their administrative motions for leave to file an opposition and reply,  
4 each party filed administrative motions for leave to file documents supporting their respective  
5 motions under seal. (Docket Nos. 1105, 1093.) As both motions for leave to file have been denied,  
6 the parties' respective administrative motions for leave to file under seal are hereby **DENIED AS**  
7 **MOOT**.

8 This order disposes of Docket Nos. 1093, 1094, 1096, 1105, and 1106.

9  
10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11  
12 Dated: October 16, 2012

13  
14   
EDWARD M. CHEN  
United States District Judge