

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
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

ON DEMAND DIRECT RESPONSE, LLC,
et al.,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

SHANA LEE MCCART-POLLAK,

Defendant(s).

Case No.: 2:15-cv-01576-MMD-NJK

Order

[Docket No. 348]

On April 20, 2018, the Court granted Ms. McCart-Pollak’s motion to compel filed against On Demand, and also awarded her costs. Docket No. 342. Now pending before the Court is Ms. McCart-Pollak’s motion to calculate those costs. Docket No. 348. The deadline to respond has expired, *see* Local Rule 7-2(b), and no response has been filed. Ms. McCart-Pollak seeks to recover \$147.42 in costs associated with the filing of the underlying motion (Docket No. 294) and reply thereto (Docket No. 304), as well as for attending the hearing on February 23, 2018. *See* Docket No. 348 at 2. The Court finds the costs requested to be excessive. Most significantly, the Court will not award costs for large purchases of printer ink claimed in association with the reply brief, but the bulk of which will undoubtedly be used elsewhere. The Court instead finds the reasonable amount of costs incurred to be \$60. On Demand shall pay Ms. McCart-Pollak that \$60 in costs within 30 days of the issuance of this order.

1 Accordingly, the pending motion to calculate costs is **GRANTED** in part and **DENIED** in
2 part.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 Dated: May 25, 2018

5 
6 _____
7 Nancy J. Koppe
8 United States Magistrate Judge
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28