

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

* * *

BANK OF AMERICA, N.A., <p style="text-align: center;">Plaintiff(s),</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> RIVERWALK RANCH CROSSING HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, et al., <p style="text-align: center;">Defendant(s).</p>		Case No. 2:16-CV-2219 JCM (VCF) <p style="text-align: center;">ORDER</p>
--	--	---

Presently before the court is defendant SFR Investments Pool 1, LLC’s motion for demand for security of costs. (ECF No. 10). Defendant asks that plaintiff Bank of America, N.A. file security of costs in the amount of \$500.00 in favor of the defendant pursuant to NRS 18.130(1) because plaintiff is a non-resident of Nevada.

The Ninth Circuit recognizes that “federal district courts have inherent power to require plaintiffs to post security for costs.” *Simulnet E. Assocs. v. Ramada Hotel Operating Co.*, 37 F.3d 573, 574 (9th Cir. 1994). A federal district court typically follows the forum state’s practice regarding security of costs, particularly when a party is a non-resident. See, e.g., 10 Charles Alan Wright & Arthur R. Miller, *Federal Practice and Procedure* § 2671 (3d ed. 1998). Section 18.130 of the Nevada Revised Statutes provides that the court may require an out-of-state plaintiff to post a security for costs in an amount up to \$500.00 upon request by a defendant. Nev. Rev. Stat. § 18.130.

This court finds it appropriate to order security of costs in this matter.

...
...

James C. Mahan
U.S. District Judge


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

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that defendant's motion for demand for security of costs (ECF No. 10) be, and the same hereby is, GRANTED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff shall post security in the amount of \$500.00 within seven (7) days of the entry of this order.

DATED October 12, 2016.


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE