

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

RAVIRAJ MOHIL, et al., etc.,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
v.)	No. 07 C 1600
)	
JILL GLICK, et al., etc.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM ORDER

More than three months after this Court's issuance of its February 1, 2012 memorandum opinion and order dismissing this action, a dispute as to the amount of taxable costs to be levied against plaintiffs still lingers on. In reply to the thoughtful response by plaintiffs' counsel to the detailed bill of costs that was tendered by defense counsel, the latter have submitted a one-page, two-paragraph statement (1) that withdraws their claim for computerized Westlaw research in the amount of \$6,435.86, while (2) reconfirming their request to be paid the remaining \$15,416.64 that they had claimed in the first instance.

That simply won't do. Is this court to operate on the premise that defense counsel has no answer to the objections that have been voiced (and supported) by plaintiffs' counsel, or is it instead expected to operate on the different premise that the amounts would not have been claimed unless they were proper? At this stage of the parties' dispute, this Court would be well within its rights if it were to take the former stance and reduce

the claim allowance to \$9,650.85, less any potential adjustment in response to plaintiffs' final request "to exercise its discretion and reduce the remaining deposition expense in an amount that the court deems appropriate."

No final order will be entered at this time. Although the prevailing defendants may not be entitled to such solicitude in light of their nonresponse, their counsel will be allowed one brief added opportunity (until May 23) to frame the issues in a manner that allows for a ruling on the merits.



Milton I. Shadur
Senior United States District Judge

Date: May 14, 2012