| 1 | | |
|----|--|---|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | UNITED STATI | ES DISTRICT COURT |
| 7 | DISTRICT OF NEVADA | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | PHILLIP J. LYONS, | |
| 10 | Plaintiff, | Case No. 2:10-CV-00707-JCM-(LRL) |
| 11 | VS. | <u>ORDER</u> |
| 12 | STATE OF NEVADA ex rel, c/o ORTIZ, et al., | |
| 13 | Defendants. | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | Presently before the court is plaintiff | f Phillip J. Lyons' pro se motion to review and deny |
| 18 | defendants' bill of costs. (Doc. #53). Defendants filed an opposition. (Doc. #56). Plaintiff argues that | |
| 19 | he was granted in forma pauperis status in st | ate court and should not be taxed these costs in federal |
| 20 | court. (Doc. #53). | |
| 21 | On August 23, 2011, defendants filed a | bill of costs totaling \$350, the cost of removing the case |
| 22 | from state to federal court. (Doc. #45). The | e clerk of court entered a clerk's judgment of \$350 on |
| 23 | September 15, 2011. (Docs. #50 and #51). E | Eleven days later, on September 26, 2011, plaintiff filed |
| 24 | the instant motion. (Docs. #53). | |
| 25 | | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | | |
| | | |
| | | |

| 1 | Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(1), the court may review the costs taxed "[o]n | |
|----|--|--|
| 2 | motion served within 7 days" of the entry of costs taxed. FED. R. CIV. P. $54(d)(1)$. ¹ In the Ninth | |
| 3 | Circuit, a party waives the right to challenge a cost award if the party fails to object to the costs within | |
| 4 | the requisite period. Walker v. Cal., 200 F.3d 624, 625-26 (9th Cir. 1999). | |
| 5 | Plaintiff failed to file his objection to the costs within the requisite 7-day period. Thus, plaintiff | |
| 6 | has waived his right to challenge the cost award. Walker, 200 F.3d at 625-26. | |
| 7 | Accordingly, | |
| 8 | IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that plaintiff Phillip J. Lyons' pro | |
| 9 | se motion to review and deny defendants' bill of costs (doc. #53) be, and the same hereby is, DENIED. | |
| 10 | DATED October 28, 2011. | |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE | |
| 13 | STATES DISTRICT JODGE | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | 1 | |
| 25 | Note to subdivision (d) of Rule 54 states that "[t]he provisions as to costs in actions in forma pauperis contained in [28 U.S.C. § 1915] are unaffected by this rule." Plaintiff was never granted <i>in forma pauperis</i> status pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, so this note is immaterial for the | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | instant motion. | |
| 28 | -2- | |
| | | |