

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
OCALA DIVISION**

BARBARA BURROWS,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No: 5:14-cv-197-Oc-30PRL

THE COLLEGE OF CENTRAL
FLORIDA,

Defendant.

ORDER

THIS CAUSE comes before the Court upon Defendant's Renewed Motion for Costs and Expenses (Doc. 56) and Plaintiff's response in opposition thereto (Doc. 58). The Court, having reviewed the motion, supporting documents, objections, and being otherwise fully advised in the premises, concludes that the motion should be granted in part and denied in part.

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff is a former employee of Defendant. Following her termination of employment with Defendant, Plaintiff initiated this action in Fifth Judicial Circuit in and for Marion County, Florida, on November 22, 2013, asserting the following claims against Defendant: (1) gender discrimination under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e-2000e-17, and the Florida Civil Rights Act, Fla. Stat. §§ 760.01-.11 ("FCRA"); (2) religious discrimination under Title VII and the FCRA; (3) marital status discrimination

under the FCRA; (4) gender stereotype discrimination under Title VII; and (5) retaliation under Title VII and the FCRA. (Doc. 2). On April 1, 2014, Defendant removed the action to this Court. (Doc. 1).

Defendant then filed a motion to dismiss Plaintiff's claims for religious discrimination and marital status discrimination. (Doc. 5). The Court granted Defendant's motion in part, dismissing Plaintiff's claim for religious discrimination. (Doc. 27). Thereafter, Defendant moved for summary judgment on Plaintiff's remaining claims, which the Court granted, entering judgment in favor of Defendant. (Docs. 43, 51, 52). Plaintiff subsequently filed a motion for reconsideration, which the Court denied. (Docs. 57, 60).

Defendant now seeks costs in the total amount of \$4,639.90 pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d). (Doc. 56.).

STANDARD FOR AWARDING COSTS

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(1) prescribes an award of costs for a prevailing party unless a federal statute, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, or a court order provides otherwise. *See Durden v. Citicorp Trust Bank, FSB*, No. 3:07-cv-974-J-34JRK, 2010 WL 2105921, at *1 (M.D. Fla. Apr. 26, 2010) (stating that Rule 54 establishes a presumption that costs should be awarded unless the district court decides otherwise (citing *Chapman v. Al Transp.*, 229 F.3d 1012, 1038 (11th Cir. 2000))). Summary judgment was granted in favor of Defendant. Thus, Defendant is the prevailing party in this case and is entitled to costs under Rule 54(d)(1). *See Powell v. Carey Int'l, Inc.*, 548 F. Supp. 2d 1351, 1356 (S.D. Fla. 2008) (stating that a prevailing party is one who

“prevailed on ‘any significant issue in the litigation which achieved some of the benefit the parties sought in bringing the suit’” (quoting *Tex. State Teachers Ass’n v. Garland Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 489 U.S. 782, 791 (1989)).

A strong presumption exists in favor of awarding costs, unless the district court decides otherwise. *See Durden*, 2010 WL 2105921, at *1; *see also Arcadian Fertilizer, L.P. v. MPW Indus. Servs., Inc.*, 249 F.3d 1293, 1296 (11th Cir. 2001). The district court’s discretion in not awarding all costs is limited; the district court must articulate a sound reason for not awarding full costs. *See Chapman*, 229 F.3d at 1038-39; *Durden*, 2010 WL 2105921, at *1. “However, a court may only tax costs as authorized by statute.” *E.E.O.C. v. W & O, Inc.*, 213 F.3d 600, 620 (11th Cir. 2000). Specifically, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1920, the following may be taxed as costs:

- (1) Fees of the clerk and marshal;
- (2) Fees for printed or electronically recorded transcripts necessarily obtained for use in the case;
- (3) Fees and disbursements for printing and witnesses;
- (4) Fees for exemplification and the costs of making copies of any materials where the copies are necessarily obtained for use in the case;
- (5) Docket fees under [28 U.S.C. § 1923]; [and]
- (6) Compensation of court appointed experts, compensation of interpreters, and salaries, fees, expenses, and costs of special interpretation services under [28 U.S.C. § 1828].

See generally Crawford Fitting Co. v. J.T. Gibbons, Inc., 482 U.S. 437, 441-42 (1987), *superseded on other grounds by* 42 U.S.C. § 1988(c) (finding that 28 U.S.C. § 1920 defines the term “costs” as used in Rule 54(d) and enumerates the expenses that a federal court

may tax as a cost under the discretionary authority granted in Rule 54(d)). The party seeking an award of costs or expenses bears the burden of submitting a request that enables a court to determine what costs or expenses were incurred by the party and the party's entitlement to an award of those costs or expenses. *Loranger v. Stierheim*, 10 F.3d 776, 784 (11th Cir. 1994).

DISCUSSION

Defendant seeks reimbursement for total costs of \$4,446.90 comprising: (1) \$400 for the removal fee; (2) \$3,671 for costs incurred in transcribing depositions; and (3) \$375.90 for the costs of copies for discovery, pleadings, correspondence, and exhibits.

1. Fees of the Clerk

Defendant first seeks reimbursement in the amount of \$400 for the cost of removing this action from state court. Fees of the clerk and marshal are recoverable under § 1920(1), and Plaintiff does not object to recovery of the removal fee. Accordingly, Defendant should be awarded \$400 in costs for fees of the Clerk.

2. Fees for Printed or Electronically Recorded Transcripts Necessarily Obtained for Use in the Case

Next, Defendant seeks reimbursement in the amount of \$3,671 for costs incurred for transcription of the depositions of Barbara Burrows, Joseph Mazur, Mark Paugh, James Roe, and Allan Danuff. Generally, § 1920(2) authorizes taxation of costs for deposition transcripts "necessarily obtained for use in the case." 28 U.S.C. § 1920(2); *see also Maris Distrib. Co. v. Anheuser-Busch, Inc.*, 302 F.3d 1207, 1225 (11th Cir. 2002). Costs for transcripts of depositions conducted in support of a motion for summary judgment or

depositions conducted of witnesses listed on a party's witness list are exemplary of the types of costs recoverable under § 1920(2). *See, e.g., Family Oriented Cmty. United Strong, Inc. v. Lockheed Martin Corp.*, No. 8:11-cv-217-T-30AEP, 2012 WL 6575348, at *1 (M.D. Fla. Dec. 17, 2012). However, "where the deposition costs were merely incurred for convenience, to aid in thorough preparation, or for purposes of investigation only, the costs are not recoverable." *W & O, Inc.*, 213 F.3d at 621.

Plaintiff agrees that Defendant is entitled to reimbursement for the costs of transcribing the depositions of Barbara Burrows and Mark Paugh since Defendant relied upon those depositions in its motion for summary judgment. Plaintiff does not agree, however, that Defendant is entitled to reimbursement for the transcription costs of the depositions of Joseph Mazur, James Roe, or Allan Danuff. Plaintiff also argues that Defendant attempts to recover several costs not recoverable under § 1920(2), such as fees for shipping and handling, costs for scanning and copying exhibits, and the costs for an "e-litigation" package.

Because Defendant relied on the depositions of Barbara Burrows and Mark Paugh in its motion for summary judgment, those depositions were necessarily obtained for use in the case and are recoverable under § 1920(2). Similarly, the depositions of Joseph Mazur, James Roe, and Allan Danuff, although not ultimately relied upon by Defendant, were not unrelated to an issue in the case at the time they were taken; thus, Defendant would be entitled to recover the costs of those depositions as well. *See Watson v. Lake Cnty.*, 492 Fed. App'x 991, 996-97 (11th Cir. 2012) ("[E]ven where a deposition is not ultimately used [at trial or in a summary judgment motion] as part of the prevailing party's

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.