

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

JSJBD CORP, D/B/A BLUE DOG'S PUB,
A NEVADA CORPORATION; STUART
VINCENT, AN INDIVIDUAL; JEFFREY
B. VINCENT, AN INDIVIDUAL; AND
JEFF WHITE, AN INDIVIDUAL,

Appellants/Cross-Respondents,

vs.

TROPICANA INVESTMENTS, LLC, A
CALIFORNIA LIMITED LIABILITY
COMPANY,

Respondent/Cross-Appellant.

No. 80849

FILED

JUN 01 2022

ELIZABETH A. BROWN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY S. Young
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER PARTIALLY APPROVING BILL OF COSTS

Respondent/cross-appellant has filed a bill of costs seeking reimbursement for making photocopies of the briefs and appendix and the costs of a rental car and lodging related to oral argument. Attached to the bill of costs is a receipt for a hotel room, what appears to be a receipt for parking, and a document listing photocopying costs. Appellants/cross-respondents object to the bill of costs on the basis that (1) NRAP 39(e) does not list lodging and car rental as permitted costs, and (2) there are no photocopying fees for the brief and appendix because those documents were electronically compiled and filed. Respondent/cross-appellant has filed a response.

Initially, although respondent/cross-appellant asks for costs relating to a rental car, the attached receipt in support of the request appears to be for parking. Further, the amount listed in the bill of costs for a rental car is the same amount as the parking receipt. It therefore appears respondent/cross-appellant seeks to tax the cost of parking rather than the cost of a rental car.

The bill of costs is disapproved with respect to the lodging costs as lodging is not a cost taxable in this court. See NRAP 39(c). The bill of costs is approved with respect to the costs for parking. It is not clear from respondent/cross-appellant's document listing photocopying expenses that all of the expenses relate to necessary copies of briefs or appendices. And respondent/cross-appellant does not respond to appellants/cross-respondents' assertion that no copies of the brief or appendices were necessary in this matter where all documents were electronically filed. Under these circumstances, the bill of costs is disapproved with respect to photocopying costs. Cf. *Bobby Berosini, Ltd. v. People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals*, 114 Nev. 1348, 971 P.2d 383 (1998) (concluding that the district court abused its discretion by awarding costs under a statute allowing costs for photocopies where the only supporting documentation listed the date of each photocopy and the total charge).

The clerk of this court shall issue an itemized statement of costs in the amount of \$20 for insertion in the remittitur.

It is so ORDERED.

 C.J.

cc: Lovato Law Firm, P.C.
Marquis Aurbach Coffing