

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUTTYCO HEALTHCARE GROUP, LP and UNITED
STATES SURGICAL CORPORATION,*Plaintiffs,**v.*

ETHICON ENDO-SURGERY, Inc.,

Defendant.

Civil No. 3:10cv60 (JBA)

December 1, 2015

RULING ON DEFENDANT’S OBJECTION TO ORDER ON BILL OF COSTS

On March 20, 2015, Defendant Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc. (“Ethicon”) submitted a bill of costs to the Court, seeking \$27,813.72 in costs associated with its defense of this case, including \$5,197.50 in videography expenses. In her April 6, 2015 Order on Defendant’s Bill of Costs [Doc. # 246], the Clerk of the Court denied the claimed videography costs on the grounds that 28 U.S.C. § 1920(2) “allows fees for printed or electronically recorded transcripts, not video recordings.” Defendant now moves [Doc. # 247] for review of the Clerk’s Order, pursuant to Local Rule 54(d).¹ In light of Plaintiffs’ failure to oppose this motion, and for many of the reasons discussed in the Court’s recent ruling in *Weber v. Fujifilm Med. Sys. U.S.A., Inc.*, No. 3:10CV401 (JBA), 2015 WL 4774466, at *4–5 (D. Conn. Aug. 13, 2015), Defendant’s Objection is SUSTAINED. Defendant is awarded \$5,197.50 for the cost of its video depositions.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/

Janet Bond Arterton, U.S.D.J

Dated at New Haven, Connecticut this 1st day of December, 2015.

¹Although Ethicon styles its motion as one for reconsideration, it is in fact an objection seeking “review of the Clerk’s ruling on the bill of costs.” D. Conn. L. Civ. R. 54(d).