

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

HELLER EHRMAN LLP,
Plaintiff,

No. C 14-01239 CRB

ORDER AWARDING COSTS

v.

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE
LLP,
Defendant.

After the Court granted summary judgment, Defendant filed, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d), a Bill of Costs (dkt. 24) seeking a total of \$48,148.90. Now before the Court are Plaintiff's objections (dkt. 27) to the Bill of Costs. Under Rule 54(d), there is a presumption that the prevailing party will be awarded its taxable costs. See Save Our Valley v. Sound Transit, 335 F.3d 932, 944 (9th Cir. 2003). To overcome this presumption, a losing party must establish a reason to deny costs. See Stanley v. Univ. of S. Cal., 178 F.3d 1069, 1079 (9th Cir. 1999). Here, Plaintiff has specifically identified "extras" which are for convenience of the lawyers and not properly billable to Plaintiff in the amount of \$13,918.62. Plaintiff's other objections are OVERRULED. Accordingly, Plaintiff is ORDERED to pay a total of \$34,230.28 in taxable costs.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 25, 2014



CHARLES R. BREYER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE