		OZIVISU RIVED ON OF RECORD
	ega (
- Y	L CHESK US DISTRICT CODE DISTRICT OF NEVADA	T DSPUTY:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

	* * *	
GEORGE CHACHAS, Plaintiff,)))) 3:07-CV-0158-LRH-	VPC
v. CITY OF ELY, NEVADA, et al.,	ORDER)	
Defendants.		

Presently before the court is defendants' motion for attorney's fees filed April 14, 2009.

Doc. #44¹. Plaintiff George Chachas ("Chachas") filed an opposition on April 29, 2009. Doc. #48.

Thereafter, defendants filed a reply on May 18, 2009. Doc. #53.

I. Facts and Procedural History

On March 30, 2007, Chachas filed a civil rights complaint against the city of Ely and members of the Ely City Council. Doc. #1. Defendants moved for summary judgment. Doc. #30. The court granted defendants' motion and the case was dismissed. Doc. #42. Thereafter, defendants moved for attorney's fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988. Doc. #44.

II. Discussion

The court, in its discretion, may award reasonable attorney's fees to a prevailing party in a

Dockets.Justia.

¹ Refers to the court's docket entry number.

civil rights action. 42 U.S.C. § 1988. However, an award of attorney's fees to a defendant is limited. *Maag v. Wessler*, 993 F.2d 718, 719 (9th Cir. 1993) (citing *Jensen v. Stangel*, 762 F.2d 815, 817 (9th Cir. 1985). "A court may grant attorney's fees to a defendant under section 1988 *only* under the limited circumstances where the action is frivolous, unreasonable, or without foundations." *Id.* (emphasis added).

An action is frivolous when the plaintiff's arguments are wholly without merit or when the plaintiff "pursues the litigation with an improper purpose, such as to annoy or embarrass the defendant." *Douglas v. Pfingston*, 284 F.3d 999, 1006 (9th Cir. 2002). Here, the court finds that Chachas' complaint was based on an incorrect, but reasonable interpretation of the laws he was challenging, and therefore, his complaint had a sufficient legal foundation. Accordingly, his complaint was not frivolous and defendants are not entitled to attorney's fees.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that defendants' motion for attorney's fees (Doc. #44) is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this **2/** day of September, 2009.

LARRY R. HICKS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE