

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
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JAMES ELLIS JOHNSON,
Plaintiff,
v.
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al,
Defendants.

Case No. [13-cv-02405-JD](#)

ORDER RE BILL OF COSTS

Re: Dkt. Nos. 337, 339

Pro se plaintiff James Johnson takes issue with the Clerk’s entry of taxed costs in the amount of \$2,753.91 against the United States. Dkt. Nos. 337, 339. The Court treats his filings as a motion for review under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(1). The taxed sum of \$2,753.91 is correct, and several claimed costs were properly denied:

- (1) The Fees of the Clerk were appropriately reduced from \$450 to \$400, which is the filing fee actually paid. Civ. L.R. 54-3(a).
- (2) Johnson did not provide documentation for Fees for Service and Summons of Subpoena. The \$250 request for those fees was properly denied. Civ. L.R. 54-1(a).
- (3) Johnson requested \$10,450 for the “cost for typing all court doc’s.” Dkt. No. 331 at 6-7. Those expenses are not allowed under 28 U.S.C. § 1920 or Civil Local Rule 54-3(d).
- (4) Expert witness fees are not allowed under Civil Local Rule 54-3(e). The fees for witnesses were properly reduced to \$950, which represents compensable transportation and subsistence costs. 28 U.S.C. § 1821; Civ. L.R. 54-3(e). The \$249.94 requested for Johnson’s travel to the deposition of his medical expert was properly excluded under Civil Local Rule 54-3(c).
- (5) Johnson requested \$936.19 in postal fees and \$951.25 in various office supplies, among other costs of reproducing and exemplifying documents. The

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

Clerk properly excluded these costs, leaving \$1,403.91 for costs of reproducing documents as outlined in Civil Local Rule 54-3(d).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 9, 2017



JAMES DONATO
United States District Judge