

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

8 HELLER EHRMAN LLP,  
9 Plaintiff,

No. C 14-01237 CRB

**ORDER AWARDING COSTS**

10 v.

11 JONES DAY,  
12 Defendant.

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California

13  
14 After the Court granted summary judgment, Defendant filed, pursuant to Federal Rule  
15 of Civil Procedure 54(d), a Bill of Costs (dkt. 26) seeking a total of \$56,298.49. Now before  
16 the Court are Plaintiff's objections (dkt. 29) to the Bill of Costs. Under Rule 54(d), there is a  
17 presumption that the prevailing party will be awarded its taxable costs. See Save Our Valley  
18 v. Sound Transit, 335 F.3d 932, 944 (9th Cir. 2003). To overcome this presumption, a losing  
19 party must establish a reason to deny costs. See Stanley v. Univ. of S. Cal., 178 F.3d 1069,  
20 1079 (9th Cir. 1999). Here, Plaintiff has specifically identified "extras" which are for  
21 convenience of the lawyers and not properly billable to Plaintiff in the amount of \$2,945.00.  
22 Plaintiff's other objections are **OVERRULED**. Accordingly, Plaintiff is **ORDERED** to pay a  
23 total of \$53,353.49 in taxable costs.

24 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

25  
26  
27 Dated: July 25, 2014



CHARLES R. BREYER  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE