

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

KRISHNA REDDY,
Plaintiff,
v.
NUANCE COMMUNICATIONS, INC.,
Defendant.

Case No. [5:11-cv-05632-PSG](#)

**OMNIBUS ORDER DENYING
MOTIONS FOR FEES, SANCTIONS,
AND LEAVE TO APPEAL IN FORMA
PAUPERIS**

(Re: Docket No. 275, 280, 302)

Plaintiff Krishna Reddy and Defendants Nuance Communications, Inc. et al. present assorted motions,¹ all of which are DENIED.

I.

On September 4, 2015, the court entered judgment.² At that time, the court invited Defendants to submit a motion for fees and costs incurred since the final pretrial conference.³ Under Civ. L.R. 54-1(a) and 54-5(a), the deadline to file a bill of costs or a motion for fees is 14 days from the entry of judgment, or in this case, by September 18, 2015.⁴ Defendants untimely moved for fees and costs on October 15, 2015,⁵ well after the deadline. Their motion for fees is DENIED.

¹ See Docket Nos. 275, 280, 302.

² See Docket Nos. 269.

³ See Docket No. 268 at 6.

⁴ See Civ. L.R. 54-1(a), 54-5(a).

⁵ See Docket No. 275.

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

II.

After Defendants moved for fees, Reddy moved for sanctions, entry of default judgment and disbarment of Defendants’ attorneys.⁶ The basis for her request is that Defendants’ motion fell outside the 14 days allotted by Civ. L.R. 54-5(a).⁷ Reddy argues that the requested sanctions are proper under Civ. L.R. 1-4, which provides that “[f]ailure by counsel or a party to comply with any duly promulgated local rule or any Federal Rule may be a ground for imposition of any authorized sanction.”⁸ Defendants’ motion was untimely and has been denied for that reason; the extreme penalties that Reddy requests are unwarranted. Her motion is DENIED.

III.

Finally, Reddy again requests leave to appeal in forma pauperis.⁹ The court denied her last request¹⁰ on the ground that her appeal was frivolous.¹¹ The Ninth Circuit then denied her motion to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal because it found that Reddy had not demonstrated indigence and because her appeal was frivolous.¹² Reddy now has filed an in forma pauperis application with information on her finances,¹³ but she has provided no basis for reconsidering the court’s prior assessment of her appeal as frivolous. This motion is DENIED.

⁶ See Docket No. 280.

⁷ See id. at 6.

⁸ See id. at 3, 6.

⁹ See Docket No. 302.

¹⁰ See Docket No. 271.

¹¹ See Docket No. 276 at 4.

¹² See Docket No. 301 at 1.

¹³ See Docket No. 302.

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

SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 21, 2015



PAUL S. GREWAL
United States Magistrate Judge