

1
2
3
4
5
6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7
8 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9

10 FREDERICK JACKSON, ASHLEY NICOLE
11 JACKSON, and BRIANA FREDRANIQUE
ANNETTE JACKSON,

12 Plaintiffs,

No. C 09-01016 WHA

13 v.

14 GERALD VINCENT LOMBARDI, individually
15 and as an officer of the City of Pittsburg Police
16 Department (Badge # 275), CORY LEE SMITH,
17 individually and as an officer of the City of
Pittsburg Police Department (Badge # 285),
18 SANKARA REDDY DUMPA, individually and
as an officer of the City of Pittsburg Police
Department (Badge # 291), WILLIAM BLAKE
HATCHER, individually and as an officer of the
City of Pittsburg Police Department (Badge #
274),

19
20 Defendants.
21 _____/

**ORDER SETTING
BRIEFING SCHEDULE
FOLLOWING REMAND**


22 This action has been remanded by our court of appeals to determine “whether or not to
23 award costs to Jackson as the prevailing party.” Plaintiff has previously filed a bill of costs (Dkt.
24 No. 216). Defendants have filed an opposition to certain items in the bill of costs, to which
25 plaintiff has filed a reply (Dkt. Nos. 227 and 240).

26 Plaintiff may file a brief in support of an award of costs by **MAY 6**. Defendants’
27 opposition or statement of non-opposition thereto is due by **MAY 20**. Plaintiff’s reply, if any, is
28 due by **MAY 27**. As the parties have fully briefed whether specific items in the bill of costs are
properly taxable, the parties’ briefs should not rehash these arguments and should instead focus

on whether the Court, in its discretion, should award costs to Jackson as the prevailing party. No hearing date will be set at this time.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 17, 2013.



WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE