

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

FADI SABA,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
UNISYS CORPORATION,  
Defendant.

Case No. [14-cv-01310-WHO](#)

**ORDER REGARDING SABA'S  
RESPONSE TO TAXATION OF COSTS**

Re: Dkt. No. 169

After I issued the Order reviewing costs, plaintiff Fadi Saba filed an opposition to defendant Unisys Corporation's petition for review. Dkt. No. 169. The docket indicated that Saba had until September 15, 2015 to respond. Accordingly, I have considered this opposition filed on September 15, 2015, and reviewed Unisys's motion to review costs. However, my decision remains the same.

This is the third time the costs have been reviewed in this case. Saba objected to Unisys's bill of costs when it was first submitted, and the clerk considered Saba's objections in awarding costs. After the clerk taxed costs, Unisys petitioned this Court for review. I granted Unisys's motion, reviewed the court's taxation of costs, and amended the clerk's award of costs. In doing so, I also looked at Saba's original objections to the costs as well as the applicable law and the necessities of this case.

I have carefully considered the arguments that Saba presents in his most recent opposition. I have also considered the governing law. They do not change any of my determinations. Many of Saba's arguments were addressed by the first award of costs by the clerk. For example, the clerk did not tax costs to expedite service, reduced costs after considering Saba's objections to travel expenses, and reduced copying fees to the allowable copying rate. I found those reductions to be appropriate and did not alter them.

1           Saba also objects to the way that the depositions were conducted, but provides no reason  
2 that this is a proper basis to deny costs. That said, I have read the depositions that the parties  
3 submitted in the summary judgment briefing, and considered them when I made my decision  
4 reviewing the costs. The costs awarded to Unisys reflect the costs that were necessary to prepare  
5 for trial.

6           Finally, Saba reiterates his argument that I disallow costs entirely. He does not provide  
7 any information that was not already addressed, or other support for his position. My decision not  
8 to exercise my discretion to disallow costs is not altered.

9           In addition, Saba raises issues with my Order as it pertained to his desire to seal certain  
10 information. I explained in the prior order that Saba, as all other litigants, must abide by the  
11 procedural requirements to file information under seal. Before he may file anything under seal, he  
12 must first file a motion to seal. Saba is encouraged to seek assistance from the pro se help desk in  
13 filing any such motions (415.782.9000 extension 8657).

14           **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

15           Dated: September 18, 2015

16             
17           \_\_\_\_\_  
18           WILLIAM H. ORRICK  
19           United States District Judge