

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**



***CLERK'S OFFICE
PROCEDURAL HANDBOOK***

JANUARY, 2014

This handbook has been prepared as a supplement to the Local Rules of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. It is intended to provide administrative information and act as a guide for specific procedural areas. However, if there is a conflict between this supplemental guide and the Local or Federal Rules of Procedure, the Rules govern.

I greatly acknowledge Kevin Dunleavy and Lucy Chin of my staff for their efforts in the production of this handbook.

We welcome any comments or suggestions for improving this handbook. Please forward your comments to: The Office of the Clerk of Court, United States District Court, Eastern District of Pennsylvania, 2609 United States Courthouse, Philadelphia, PA 19106-1797 or fax them to: 215-597-6390.

**Michael E. Kunz
Clerk of Court**

<http://www.paed.uscourts.gov>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>ELECTRONIC CASE FILING SYSTEM</u>	1
A. Rule 5.1.2 – Electronic Case Filing Procedures	2
B. Eligibility, Registration and Password	5
C. Signature	9
D. Excluded Cases and Documents	13
E. Training Seminars	15
<u>FILING A CIVIL ACTION</u>	16
A. Civil Justice Delay and Expense Reduction Plan	18
B. Designation Form	18
- Instructions for Completing the Designation Form	18
C. Civil Cover Sheet (Form JS44)	20
- Instructions for Completing the Civil Cover Sheet	20
D. Case Management Track Designation Form	24
E. Verifications	25
F. Filing and Amended Complaint	25
G. Class Action Complaints – Local Rule 23.1	25
H. Copies of Complaints	25
I. Service of Process	26
J. Waiver of Service of Summons	26
<u>DOCUMENTS</u>	27
A. Copies of Paper Documents	28
B. Certificate of Service	29
C. Third-Party Complaint	29
D. Excluded Personal Identifiers – Local Rule of Civil Procedure 5.1.3	30
E. Electronic Case File Privacy – Local Rule of Criminal Procedure 53.2	30

F.	Sealed Pleadings	31
G.	False Claims Act Cases	32
H.	Pleadings that are <i>NOT</i> Filed	32
I.	Facsimile Transmission of Notice of Orders in Civil and Criminal Cases	33
J.	Mail	33
 MOTIONS		35
 SUMMONS		35
 JURISDICTION		36
 SUBPOENAS		36
A.	Civil	36
B.	Criminal	37
 FOREIGN SUBPOENAS		38
A.	Filing Procedure in Out-of-State Court	38
B.	Service	38
C.	To Contest	38
D.	Attendance	38
 DISCOVERY		39
 TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER (T.R.O.)		39
 WRIT OF GARNISHMENT, ATTACHMENT AND EXECUTION		39

<u>FILING OF JUDGMENT BY DEFAULT</u>	39
A. <u>Rule 55(a), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure</u>	39
B. <u>Rule 55(b), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure</u>	40
 <u>MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION</u>	 40
 <u>ARBITRATION</u>	 41
A. <u>Procedure for Cases Eligible for Arbitration</u>	41
B. <u>Trial Procedure</u>	41
C. <u>Arbitrators</u>	41
D. <u>Arbitrators' Award</u>	42
E. <u>Demand for Trial De Novo</u>	42
 <u>APPEALS</u>	 42
A. <u>Civil</u>	42
B. <u>Criminal</u>	43
C. <u>Report and Recommendation of U.S. Magistrate Judge</u>	43
D. <u>Bankruptcy</u>	43
E. <u>Patent – “Little Tucker Act” Cases and Claims Court Transfer Cases</u>	43
F. <u>Service</u>	43
G. <u>Filing Fee</u>	44
H. <u>Preparation of the Record on Appeal</u>	44
 <u>CERTIFICATION OF JUDGMENT (AO 451)</u>	 44
 <u>REFERRAL TO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE</u>	 45
 <u>POST JUDGMENT INTEREST RATE</u>	 45

<u>TAXATION OF COSTS</u>	47
A. Normally Allowable District Court Costs (sought pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1920) in General	48
B. Normally Unallowable District Court Costs in General	49
C. Burden of Proof Regarding Normally Allowable District Court Costs (sought pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1920)	51
D. General Objections to Normally Allowable District Court Costs (sought pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1920) in their Entirety	52
E. Specific Objections to Normally Allowable District Court Costs (sought pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1920)	60
F. Special Procedures for Allowance of District Court Costs in Situations Involving Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 68 (and not involving 28 U.S.C. § 1920)	69
G. Taxation of Appellate Court Costs by the Clerk of the District Court	70
<u>COURTROOM DEPUTY CLERKS</u>	100
A. New Case Procedures	100
B. Pretrial Practices	100
C. Scheduling Cases	100
D. Trial List	101
E. Judicial Schedule of Trials – Automated System Inquiry (<i>JUST-ASK</i>)	102
F. Lobby Kiosk Information System	103
G. Busy Slips	103
H. Attachments for Trial	103
I. Continuances – Criminal Cases	103
J. Motions	104
K. Exhibits	104
L. Other Duties	104

<u>Listing of Courtroom Deputy Clerks</u>	105
<u>STANDING ORDER RE: SENTENCING REFORM ACT OF 1984</u>	107
<u>AFTER-HOURS CONTACT FOR EMERGENCY MATTERS</u>	107
<u>AFTER-HOURS FILING DEPOSITORY</u>	108
<u>OPINIONS / CORRESPONDENCE CLERK</u>	108
<u>HOW TO FIND A CASE NUMBER</u>	108
<u>CLERK’S INDEX FILE BY NATURE OF SUIT</u>	109
<u>COPY WORK</u>	109
<u>RECORDS ROOM</u>	109
<u>CREDIT CARD COLLECTION NETWORK</u>	109
<u>REQUIRED CHECK CONVERSION DISCLOSURE</u>	110
<u>DEPOSITING / WITHDRAWING MONIES</u>	110
A. <u>Deposits</u>	111
B. <u>Registry Fund, Deposit Fund, Interest-Bearing Accounts</u>	111
<u>FINES</u>	112
<u>CENTRAL VIOLATIONS BUREAU (CVB)</u>	112

<u>BAIL BONDS</u>	113
<u>ATTORNEY ADMISSIONS</u>	113
<u>COURT REPORTING / RECORDING SERVICES</u>	114
<u>ELECTRONIC TRANSCRIPTS OF COURT PROCEEDINGS</u>	114
<u>DIGITAL AUDIO FILE ELECTRONIC ACCESS PROGRAM</u>	115
<u>VIDEOTAPE SERVICES</u>	115
<u>VIDEO TELECONFERENCING</u>	115
<u>COURTROOM TECHNOLOGY</u>	116
<u>INTERPRETERS' SERVICES</u>	116
<u>JURY SELECTION</u>	116
A. <u>Term of Jury Service</u>	117
B. <u>Excuse from Jury Service on Request</u>	117
C. <u>Payment</u>	117
<u>INCLEMENT WEATHER</u>	118
<u>PACER – PUBLIC ACCESS TO COURT ELECTRONIC RECORDS</u>	118
<u>INTERNET WEBSITE</u>	119
<u>LOCAL RULES</u>	120

PORTABLE ELECTRONIC DEVICES AND PUBLIC TELEPHONE LOCATIONS..... 120

DIRECTORY OF PUBLIC TELEPHONE LOCATIONS..... 121

PERSONNEL DIRECTORY..... 122

LIST OF APPENDICES..... 131

INDEX..... 133

ELECTRONIC CASE FILING SYSTEM

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania utilizes an automated civil docketing system, Case Management/Electronic Case Filing (“CM/ECF”).

Effective May 27, 2003, dockets for all civil cases filed since July 1, 1990 and dockets for all criminal cases filed since July 1, 1992 will be available for viewing and printing from the CM/ECF system.

All new civil cases filed in this court are entered into this court’s Electronic Case Filing (“ECF”) system in accordance with provisions of the Electronic Case Filing Procedures (**Appendix A**). CM/ECF provides a new, easy-to-use electronic case filing feature that will allow users to file and view court documents over the Internet. Documents are automatically docketed as part of the filing process and are immediately available electronically. CM/ECF also offers the following benefits:

- 24-hour access to filed documents over the Internet;
- automatic e-mail notice of case activity to attorneys of record and judges;
- ability to download and print documents directly from the court system;
- concurrent access to case files by multiple parties; and
- secure storage of documents.

- A. **RULE 5.1.2 – ELECTRONIC CASE FILING PROCEDURES.** All cases and documents filed in this court are required to be filed on the Electronic Case Filing (“ECF”) System in accordance with provisions of the *Electronic Case Filing (“ECF”) Procedures*, as set forth below unless excepted under these procedures.

Rule 5.1.2 Electronic Case Filing (“ECF”) Procedures

1. Definitions

- (a) "ECF Filing User" means those who have Court-issued log-ins and passwords to file documents electronically.
- (b) "Notice of Electronic Case Filing" means the notice generated by the ECF system when a document has been filed electronically, stating that the document has been filed.
- (c) "Judge" means the District Judge assigned to the case, or the Magistrate Judge to whom all or any part of a case has been referred pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636.
- (d) "Court" shall mean the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

2. Scope of Electronic Case Filing

- (a) All civil and criminal cases filed in this court are required to be entered into the court’s Electronic Case Filing (“ECF”) System in accordance with these Electronic Case Filing (“ECF”) Procedures. Unless an attorney is excused from ECF registration under Section 3 of these ECF Procedures or except as expressly provided in Section 16 and other sections of these ECF Procedures, or as ordered by the judge, all pleadings, documents, motions, memoranda of law, petitions, certificates of service and other documents required to be filed with the Clerk of Court in connection with a case must be electronically filed.

- (b) The filing of all initial papers in civil cases, such as the complaint and the issuance and service of the summons, and, in criminal cases, the indictment or information, warrant for arrest or summons, will be accomplished by paper copy filed in the traditional manner rather than electronically. Parties must concurrently provide the Clerk of Court with a computer disk, in PDF format (**Appendix B**) containing a copy of all documents provided in paper form at the time of filing. All subsequent documents and pleadings must be filed electronically, except as provided in these ECF Procedures or as ordered by the judge. Under this paragraph, all attorneys are required to complete the ECF Validation of Signature form (**Appendix C**), as described in Section 3(c) below.
- (c) Once registered, an ECF Filing User may request to withdraw from participation in the ECF System by providing the Clerk of Court with written notice of the request which shall be forwarded to the Chief Judge for approval.
- (d) Nothing in these ECF Procedures shall be construed to nullify or contradict the provisions set forth in Rule 26.1 of the Local Rules of Civil Procedure, *Discovery*, directing that interrogatories, requests for production and inspection and requests for admission under Fed. R.Civ.P. 33, 34 and 36 that answers, responses and objections to interrogatories and to Rules 34 and 36, and that requests, notices of depositions and depositions under Fed.R.Civ.P. 30 and 31, shall not be filed with the court.
- (e) Nothing in these ECF Procedures shall be construed to nullify or contradict the provisions set forth in Rule 39.3 of the Local Rules of Civil Procedure, *Records, Files and Exhibits*, directing that the Clerk of Court maintain custody of all records, files and exhibits in all cases filed in this court until such time as the case is finally resolved, dismissed or abandoned, as set forth in paragraph (e) of Rule 39.3.
- (f) All cases filed in the ECF System in which a notice of appeal is filed shall be governed by Rule 10 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure and relevant Local Rules and internal operating procedures of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, with any

differences about whether the record truly discloses what occurred in the district court to be submitted to and settled by the judge. Cases in which there is a right of direct appeal to the United States Supreme Court shall be governed by the rules of the United States Supreme Court.

3. Excuse From Registration; Format of Documents in Electronic Form

An attorney who believes he or she should be excused from registering as an ECF Filing User may apply for an exception to this rule by detailed letter to the Clerk of Court, who shall forward the letter to the chief judge for decision. Thereafter, attorneys and others who are excused from registering as ECF Filing Users in accordance with this section are required to comply with the procedures set forth below.

- (a) All complaints must be submitted on disk in portable document format (PDF) at the time of filing, so that the complaint may be entered into the District Court's ECF system, and must be accompanied by a courtesy copy of the complaint in paper format for use by the court; under this paragraph, all attorneys are required to complete the ECF Validation of Signature form (**Appendix C**), as described in Paragraph (c) below.
- (b) All documents filed by an attorney who has been excused from registering as an ECF Filing User, as defined under this rule, must be submitted on disk in PDF, so that the filings may be entered into the District Court's ECF system, and must be accompanied by a courtesy copy of the document in paper format for use by the court; under this paragraph, all attorneys are required to complete the ECF Validation of Signature form, as described in Paragraph (c) below.
- (c) Attorneys who complete the ECF Validation of Signature form will receive a signature code which must be used by the attorney on the signature line of all courtesy copies submitted with a disk for purposes of signature validation pursuant to Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; the document as submitted under Section 3 of this rule will constitute the original document, except for those documents which are excluded from the provisions of rule as set forth

in Section 16 of the rule; attorneys are required to have submitted a completed ECF Validation of Signature form just once in order to file all complaints and documents in all subsequent cases in this court.

- (d) Service of process will continue to be made in accordance with those provisions set forth in Rule 5 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
- (e) For convenience of attorneys who do not have access to compatible hardware or software, a computer with PDF conversion capability is available in the Clerk's Offices at Philadelphia and Allentown, with assistance for PDF conversion provided by Clerk's Office staff as needed; attorneys who have reason for not providing this material on disk are required to notice the Clerk's Office in writing attached to the document, explaining the reason for not providing this material on disk.
- (f) Attorneys who have been excused under this section from registering as ECF Filing Users are requested to register and participate in the court's Program for Facsimile Service of Notice to Counsel or Litigants in Civil and Criminal Cases (the "Fax Noticing Program").
- (g) Those documents and categories of cases which are now excluded from the provisions of this section consistent with the policy of the Judicial Conference of the United States, as may be amended from time to time, are set forth in Section 16 of this rule (**Appendix A, Section 16**).

4. Eligibility, Registration and Password

- (a) Unless otherwise excused, attorneys admitted to the bar of this court, including those admitted pro hac vice, are required to register as ECF Filing Users of the court's ECF system. Registration is in a form prescribed by the Clerk of Court (**Appendix D**) and requires the Filing User's name, address, telephone number, Internet e-mail address and a declaration that the attorney is admitted to the bar of this court and is a member in good standing.

- (b) Upon the approval of the judge, a party to a case who is not represented by an attorney may register as an ECF Filing User in the ECF System solely for purposes of the action. Registration is in a form prescribed by the Clerk of Court and requires identification of the case as well as the name, address, telephone number and Internet e-mail address of the party. If, during the course of the case, the party retains an attorney who appears on the party's behalf, the attorney must advise the Clerk of Court to terminate the party's registration as a Filing User upon the attorney's appearance.
- (c) Registration as an ECF Filing User constitutes agreement to receive and consent to make electronic service of all documents as provided in these ECF Procedures in accordance with Rule 5(b)(2)(D) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, as referenced in Rule 49(b) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. This agreement and consent is applicable to all future cases until revoked by the ECF Filing User.
- (d) Once registration is completed, the ECF Filing User will receive notification of the user log-in and password. ECF Filing Users agree to protect the security of their passwords and immediately notify the Clerk of Court by telephone, with said notification confirmed immediately thereafter in writing delivered by e-mail, facsimile or hand-delivery to the attention of the Clerk of Court, if they learn that their password has been compromised. Users may be subject to sanctions by the judge for failure to comply with this provision. For security reasons, the court recommends that ECF Filing Users periodically change their passwords which shall be done by notifying the clerk of the court who shall implement the change.

5. Consequences of Electronic Filing

- (a) Electronic transmission of a document to the ECF System consistent with these ECF Procedures, together with the transmission of a notice of electronic case filing from the court, constitutes filing of the document for all purposes of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the

Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure and the Local Rules of this court, and constitutes entry of the document on the docket maintained by the Clerk of Court pursuant to Rules 58 and 79 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Rules 49 and 55 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

- (b) A document that has been filed electronically is the official record of the document, and the filing party is bound by the document as filed. Except in the case of documents first filed in paper form and subsequently submitted electronically under Section 2 above, a document filed electronically is deemed filed at the time and date stated on the notice of electronic case filing from the court.
- (c) Filing a document electronically does not change any filing deadline set by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, the Local Rules of the court, or an order of the judge.
- (d) All pleadings and documents filed electronically must be transmitted in the form prescribed by Rule 10(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. All transmissions for electronic case filings of pleadings and documents to the ECF system shall be titled in accordance with the approved directory of civil and criminal events of the ECF system.

6. Attachments and Exhibits

ECF Filing Users may submit all documents identified as exhibits or attachments in either paper copy filed in the traditional manner or electronic form. If using electronic form, an ECF Filing User must submit as exhibits or attachments only those excerpts of the identified documents that are relevant to the matter under consideration by the court. Excerpted material must be clearly and prominently identified as such. ECF Filing Users who file excerpts of documents as exhibits or attachments electronically pursuant to these ECF Procedures do so without prejudice to their right to file timely additional excerpts or the complete document, provided however, that the total number of pages of attachments and exhibits electronically filed shall not exceed 50 without prior approval of the judge. Pages of attachments and exhibits in excess of 50 may be filed in paper copy filed in the traditional manner. Responding parties who choose to file exhibits and attachments

electronically may also timely file additional excerpts or the complete document, subject to the same page limitations as set forth above.

7. Sealed Documents

Documents ordered to be placed under seal must be filed in paper copy filed in the traditional manner and not electronically. A motion to file documents under seal may be filed electronically unless prohibited by law. The order of the court authorizing the filing of documents under seal may be filed electronically unless prohibited by law. A paper copy of the order must be attached to the documents under seal and be delivered to the Clerk of Court.

8. Service of Documents by Electronic Means

(a) When an ECF Filing User electronically files a pleading or other document using the ECF system, a Notice of Electronic Case Filing shall automatically be generated by the system, and shall be sent automatically to all parties entitled to service under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure and the Local Rules of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania who have consented to electronic service. Electronic service of the Notice of Electronic Case Filing constitutes service of the filed document to all such parties and shall be deemed to satisfy the requirements of Rule 5(b)(2)(D) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Rule 49 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

(b) All documents filed using the ECF system shall contain a Certificate of Service stating that the document has been filed electronically and is available for viewing and downloading from the ECF system. The Certificate of Service must identify the manner in which service on each party was accomplished, including any party who has not consented to electronic service.

- (c) Parties who have not consented to electronic service are entitled to receive a paper copy of any electronically filed pleading or other document. Service of such paper copy must be made according to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure and the Local Rules of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.
- (d) As set forth in Section 4 of these ECF Procedures, registration as an ECF Filing User constitutes agreement to receive and consent to make electronic service of all documents as provided in these ECF Procedures in accordance with Rule 5(b)(2)(D) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Rule 49 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. This agreement and consent is applicable to all pending and future actions assigned to the ECF System until revoked by the ECF Filing User.
- (e) In accordance with Rule 6(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, service by electronic means is treated the same as service by mail for the purpose of adding three (3) days to the prescribed period to respond.
- (f) In accordance with Rule 77(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the court may serve notice of entry of orders or judgments by electronic means as provided in Rule 5(b) and Section 4 of this Procedural Order.
- (g) In civil cases, the provisions of this Section 8 apply to service of documents covered by Rule 5(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Service of Original Process under Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure is not authorized under these ECF Procedures to be accomplished electronically. This Section 8 does not apply to service of an arrest warrant, summons or subpoena in criminal cases.

9. Signature

- (a) The user log-in and password required to submit documents to the ECF System serve as the ECF Filing User's signature on all electronic documents filed with the court. They also serve as a signature for purposes of Rule 11(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Rules of this court, and any other purpose for which a signature

is required in connection with proceedings before the court. Each document filed electronically must, if possible, indicate that it has been electronically filed. Electronically filed documents must include a signature block and must set forth the name, address, telephone number and the attorney's state bar identification number, if applicable. In addition, the name of the ECF Filing User under whose log-in and password the document is submitted must be preceded by an "s/" and typed in the space where the signature would otherwise appear.

- (b) No ECF Filing User or other person may knowingly permit or cause to permit a Filing User's password to be used by anyone other than an authorized agent of the Filing User.
- (c) Documents requiring signatures of more than one party must be electronically filed either by: (1) submitting a scanned document containing all necessary signatures; (2) representing the consent of the other parties on the document; (3) identifying on the document the parties whose signatures are required and by the submission of a notice of endorsement by the other parties no later than seven (7) days after filing; or (4) any other manner approved by the court.

10. Submission of Stipulations and Proposed Orders

An ECF Filing User electronically submitting stipulations or proposed orders which may require a judge's signature must promptly deliver on computer disk or e-mail the stipulation or proposed order to the Clerk of Court at ECF_clerksoffice@paed.uscourts.gov for delivery to the judge unless the judge orders otherwise. An ECF Filing User who electronically submits a stipulation or proposed order is bound by all signature requirements set forth in Section 9 of these ECF Procedures and Rule 11(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

11. Retention Requirements

Documents that are electronically filed and require original signatures other than that of the Filing User must be maintained in paper form by the ECF Filing User until three (3) years after the time period for appeal expires. The ECF Filing User must provide original documents for review upon request of the judge.

12. Public Access

- (a) Any person or organization, other than one registered as an ECF Filing User under Section 4 of these rules, may access the ECF Filing System at the court's Internet site, www.paed.uscourts.gov by obtaining a PACER log-in and password. Those who have PACER access but who are not Filing Users may retrieve docket sheets and those documents which the court makes available on the Internet for the fee normally charged for this service as set by the fee schedule authorized by the Administrative Office of United States Courts, but they may not file documents.
- (b) Documents should be made available electronically to the same extent that they are available for personal inspection in the office of the Clerk of Court at the U.S. Courthouse. Social Security numbers, dates of birth, financial account numbers and names of minor children should be modified or partially redacted in electronically filed documents.
- (c) In connection with the electronic filing of any material, any person may apply by motion for an order limiting electronic access to, or prohibiting the electronic filing of, certain specifically identified materials on the grounds that such material is subject to privacy interests and that electronic access or electronic filing in the action is likely to prejudice those privacy interests. In further protection of privacy, reference is made to the provisions of Rule 5.1.3 of the Local Rules of Civil Procedure, *Excluded Personal Identifiers*, mandating the modification or redaction of such personal identifiers as Social Security numbers, dates of birth, financial account numbers and names of minor children in all documents filed either in traditional paper form or electronically.

13. Entry of Court Order

All orders, decrees, judgments and proceedings of the court will be filed in accordance with these rules which will constitute entry on the docket maintained by the Clerk of Court pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 58 and 79, and Rules 49 and 55 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. All signed orders will be filed electronically by the Clerk of Court. Any order filed electronically without the original signature of a judge has the same force and effect as if the judge had affixed the judge's signature to a paper copy of the order and it had been entered on the docket in paper copy filed in the traditional manner.

14. Notice of Court Order and Judgment

Immediately upon the entry of an order or judgment, the Clerk of Court will transmit to ECF Filing Users in the case, in electronic form, a notice of electronic filing. Electronic transmission of the Notice of Electronic Case Filing constitutes the notice required by Rule 77(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Rule 49(c) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. In accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Clerk of Court must give notice in paper form to a person who has been excused under Section 3 of Local Rule 5.1.2 from registering as an ECF Filing User.

15. Technical Failure

An ECF Filing User whose filing is determined to be untimely as the result of a technical failure may seek appropriate relief from the judge, provided that the User immediately notifies the Clerk of Court of the technical failure by telephone, with said notification confirmed immediately thereafter in writing delivered by e-mail, facsimile or by hand to the attention of the Clerk of Court. The clerk of the court shall forthwith notify the chambers of the judge.

16. Categories of Cases and Types of Documents in Civil and Criminal Cases Excluded from Electronic Case Filing

As provided in Section 2(b) above, all initial papers in civil and criminal cases, including the complaint, amended complaint, third-party complaint, notice of removal, the issuance and service of the summons, and the indictment and information in criminal cases, cannot be electronically filed

on the court's CM/ECF system, but must be filed on paper accompanied by a copy of the document on disk in PDF format. Additionally, the following types of documents and categories of cases, as may be amended from time to time (**Appendix A, Section 16**), can neither be electronically filed on the court's CM/ECF system nor submitted on disk in PDF format by an attorney excused from participation from ECF pursuant to Section 3 of these procedures, but must be filed in paper copy, filed in the traditional manner, consistent with the policy of the Judicial Conference of the United States:

A. EXCLUDED CASES

1. Grand jury matters
2. Qui tam cases
3. Sealed cases

B. EXCLUDED DOCUMENTS

CIVIL CASES

1. Administrative records.
2. All documents filed by prisoners and pro se litigants, including the initial complaint and initial habeas corpus petitions, and death penalty habeas corpus petitions.
3. Bankruptcy appeal records.
4. Sealed documents.
5. State court records.
6. Transcript of civil proceedings shall be placed on CM/ECF or PACER, unless the presiding judge otherwise directs.
7. Discovery material, as set forth in Rule 26.1 of the Local Rules of Civil Procedure, *Discovery*, including:

- a) interrogatories, requests for production and inspection and requests for admission under Rules 33, 34 and 36 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure;
 - b) answers, responses and objections to interrogatories and to Rules 34 and 36 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure;
 - c) requests, notices of depositions and depositions under Rules 30 and 31 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
- 8. Praecipe for Writ of Execution.
 - 9. Applications for Writ of Continuing Garnishment.
 - 10. Praecipe to Issue Writ of Revival.
 - 11. Praecipe for Writ of Seizure.
 - 12. Praecipe for Writ to Restore.
 - 13. Civil Jury Verdict Sheets.
 - 14. Civil Minute Sheets.
 - 15. Ex Parte Motions.

CRIMINAL CASES

- 1. Sealed documents.
- 2. Transcript of criminal proceedings shall not be placed on CM/ECF or PACER, unless the presiding judge otherwise directs after giving the prosecution and defense counsel an opportunity to be heard.

3. All documents requiring the signature of a defendant in a criminal or magistrate proceeding, such as waiver of indictment, waiver of presentence report, waiver of a jury trial, plea agreement, appearance bond, affidavit, and financial affidavit.
 4. Criminal Jury Verdict Sheets.
 5. Presentence Reports and any objections or other documents filed related to the Presentence Reports.
 6. Criminal Minute Sheets.
 7. Judgment and Commitment Orders.
 8. Ex parte Motions.
17. Training Seminars

ECF training is available to members of the bar, paralegals, secretaries and automation support staff. For information regarding participation in the court's CM/ECF system, see ***Appendix E***.

FILING A CIVIL ACTION

The filing of all initial papers in civil case, such as the complaint and the issuance and service of the summons, and, in criminal case, the indictment information, and warrant for arrest or summons, will be accomplished by paper copy filed in the traditional manner, rather than electronically. Parties must concurrently provide the Clerk of Court with a computer disk containing a PDF format copy of all documents provided in paper form at the time of filing. All subsequent documents and pleadings must be filed electronically, except as provided in ECF Procedures or as ordered by the judge. Under this paragraph, all attorneys are required to complete the ECF Validation of Signature form, as described in Section 3(c) of the ECF Procedures.

All new civil actions are to be filed on 8 ½" x 11" paper in the Clerk's Office, Room 2609, second floor of the Federal Courthouse, or in the divisional office in Allentown, Pennsylvania, between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Filings are accepted by mail, as well as in person. The addresses are:

**United States District Court
Eastern District of Pennsylvania
U.S. Courthouse
601 Market Street, Room 2609
Philadelphia, PA 19106-1797
(215) 597-7704**

or

**United States District Court
U.S. Courthouse and Federal Building
504 West Hamilton Street, Suite 1601
Allentown, PA 18101-1500
(610) 434-3896**

Parties are invited to participate in a pilot filing complaints electronically on the CM/ECF system. If you are interested in this program, please complete an information form (***Appendix EE***) and you will be contacted by the Clerk's Office for training.

The cost for filing a civil action is \$400.00 (a \$350 filing fee established by 28 U.S.C. § 1914(A), plus a \$50 administrative fee established by The Judicial Conference. The \$50 administrative fee shall not be charged to petitioners in civil actions seeking Habeas Corpus relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2241-2266). Payment may be made in three forms: cash, credit card, or checks made payable to: "***Clerk, U.S. District Court***".

All subsequent filings, motions, pleadings and other papers are to be filed electronically by the ECF system or on disk in PDF format accompanied by a courtesy copy, by mail or, in person in Room 2609 at the courthouse in Philadelphia or Suite 1601 at the divisional office in Allentown.

Counsel should include the following in the drafting of the complaint or petition:

- (a) name of court;
- (b) name and address of both parties, in caption form;
- (c) title of action;
- (d) a short and plain statement of the grounds upon which the court's jurisdiction depends;
- (e) a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief;
- (f) a demand for judgment for the relief to which the plaintiff deems himself entitled;
- (g) jury demand; and
- (h) name, address, Pennsylvania attorney identification number and signature of plaintiff's attorney.

A. Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan

In response to a mandate by the Civil Justice Reform Act of 1990 and, in an effort to reduce the cost and delay of civil litigation in the federal courts, this district adopted The Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan with an effective date of December 31, 1991. A copy of the plan can be obtained by contacting Aida Ayala at (267) 299-7099. This district was selected as a pilot district and was required to implement a plan by December 31, 1991. An Advisory Group was appointed in April, 1991 to prepare a report and recommendation on the status of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. Based on this report, the judges adopted the expense and delay reduction plan.

B. Designation Form

The designation form (*Appendix F*) is to be used by counsel to designate the category of the cause of action for the purpose of assignment to the appropriate calendar. It is to be completed by plaintiff's counsel and submitted at the time of filing.

The court requires two (2) copies of the designation form. Additional forms are not required for additional defendants, nor are additional forms required when the United States Government or an officer or agency thereof is involved.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE DESIGNATION FORM

1. **Address of Plaintiff and Defendant.** House or apartment address, street, city, county and zip codes are required in this section.
2. **Place of Accident.** The place of the accident, incident, or transaction; house or apartment address, street, city, county and zip code are required in this section. NOTE: Counsel should continue on reverse side if additional space is needed to fully explain this matter.
3. **Disclosure Statement.** In accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 7.1(a), *Disclosure Statement*, a

non-governmental corporate party to an action or proceeding in a district court must file copies of a statement that identifies any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation that owns 10% or more of its stock or state that there is no such corporation (*Appendix G*).

A party must file the Rule 7.1(a) statement with its first appearance, pleading, petition, motion, response, or other request addressed to the court, and promptly file a supplemental statement upon any change in the information that the statement requires.

4. **Related Cases.** This refers to pending cases or cases disposed of in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania within a one-year period.

If the case is related, counsel must indicate the case number, the presiding judge, and the date terminated.

5. **Civil Category Checklist.** Counsel is required to determine whether the action arises under: (a) federal question, Title 28 U.S.C. § 1331; or (b) diversity, Title 28 U.S.C. § 1332. Counsel must check off the *one* specific category within the appropriate classification to which that case pertains. This is for the purpose of proper case assignment by classification.
6. **Arbitration Certification.** The arbitration certification is used to determine whether or not the case exceeds the damages threshold of \$150,000, which is the maximum amount for any arbitration proceeding. Counsel is advised to refer to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3, Paragraph C, which states that damages will be presumed to be less than \$150,000 and thus, eligible for arbitration unless counsel, at the time of filing, states

that the damages exceed that amount. The effect of this certification is to remove the case from eligibility for arbitration. Date and signature must be included in this section.

7. **Date and Signature.** The date of filing and signature of counsel is required in this section.

C. **Civil Cover Sheet (Form JS44)**

The Civil Cover Sheet (*Appendix H*) is required by the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. It is completed by plaintiff's counsel and submitted at the time of filing. Only one civil cover sheet is required by the court to accompany the complaint, regardless of whether or not the United States of America, or an officer of any agency thereof, is a party.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING A CIVIL COVER SHEET

1. **Parties.** The complete name(s), and address(es) of plaintiff(s) and defendant(s) are required in this section.

2. **Attorneys.**

Plaintiff's Attorney: Firm name, address, Pennsylvania Bar identification number and telephone number are required.

Defendant's Attorney: Firm name, address, Pennsylvania Bar identification number and telephone number, if known, are required.

3. **Jurisdiction.** Counsel should place an "X" in the appropriate box corresponding to the jurisdictional basis of the action.

The following order of priority should be utilized in cases where more than one basis of jurisdiction is set out in the complaint.

- (a) United States Plaintiff. Jurisdiction is based on 28 U.S.C. §§ 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are in this category.
- (b) United States Defendant. Jurisdiction is based on 28 U.S.C. § 1346 and includes suits against agencies and officers of the United States.
- (c) Federal Question. Various statutes give the district court jurisdiction to hear and determine controversies where federal rights between parties are covered by statute or Constitution.
- (d) Diversity of Citizenship. This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. § 1332. In this situation, parties are residents of different states.

Note: If diversity is checked, it must be further categorized in the box to the right.

4. **Nature of Suit.** Counsel must indicate the general description of the suit by placing an “X” in the appropriate box. If more than one possible category applies, select the most explicit and specific classification.

Note: Only one check mark is to be made in this area.

Explanatory Information for Social Security. In the section for Social Security, six (6) possible types of claims or actions are listed.

SUIT CODE NUMBER	ABBREVIATION FOR CAUSE OF ACTION	SUBSTANTIVE STATEMENT EXPLAINING TYPE
861	HIA	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title XVIII, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Also includes claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc. for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. § 395f(b)).
862	BL	All claims for "black lung" benefits under Title IV, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 (30 U.S.C. § 923).
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title II of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability (42 U.S.C. § 405(g)).
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widows' or widowers' insurance benefits based on disability under Title XVI of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. § 405(g)).
864	SSID	All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title XVI of the Social Security Act, as amended.
865	RSI	All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors' benefits under Title II of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. § 405(g)).

5. **Origin.** Counsel is required to indicate which one of the seven possible categories is applicable to the case being filed. The following explanatory guidelines should be consulted in this matter.
- (a) Original Proceeding. This category will be the appropriate one for most cases.
 - (b) Removed from State Court. Proceedings initiated in the State Courts may be removed to the District Court under Title 28 U.S.C. § 1441.
 - (c) Remanded from Appellate Court. Use the date of remand as the filing date.
 - (d) Reinstated or Reopened. Use the reopening date as the filing date.
 - (e) Transferred from Another District. Self-Explanatory.
 - (f) Multidistrict Litigation. Use when a multidistrict case is transferred into this district (Title 28 U.S.C. § 1407).
6. **Cause of Action.** In this section, a citation must be used for the U.S. civil statute under which the filing is made. In addition, a brief statement of the cause of action must also be included by counsel.
7. **Class Action.** This item should be checked if the case is alleged to be a class action under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23.

Demand: The dollar amount which is sought in the case should be inserted in this space.

Jury Demand: Counsel should check “yes” in this section only if a jury trial is demanded in the complaint.

8. **Related Case(s), if any.** This section is used to reference relating pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases or cases disposed of within a one-year period, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judges' names for such cases.
9. **Date and Signature.** The date of filing and the signature should be the final insertion on the Civil Cover Sheet.

D. Case Management Track Designation Form

Each civil case will be assigned to one of the following tracks (*Appendix I*):

1. **Habeas Corpus.** Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.
2. **Social Security.** Cases requesting review of a decision made by the Secretary of Health and Human Services that denied the plaintiff Social Security benefits.
3. **Arbitration.** Cases designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.
4. **Asbestos.** Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos.
5. **Special Management.** Cases that do not fall into tracks 1 through 4 or that need special or intense management by the court do to one or more of the following factors:
 - (a) large number of parties;
 - (b) large number of claims;
 - (c) complex factual issues;
 - (d) large volume of evidence;
 - (e) problems locating or preserving evidence;
 - (f) extensive discovery;
 - (g) exceptionally long time needed to prepare for disposition;
 - (h) decision needed within an exceptionally short time; or
 - (i) need to decide preliminary issues before final disposition.

6. **Standard Management.** Cases that do not fall into any of the other tracks.

E. Verifications

Verifications or affidavits are not required to be filed with a complaint, except:

- (a) where the complaint seeks entry of a temporary restraining order [Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(b)]; and
- (b) in shareholder derivative actions [Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23.1].

In lieu of a verification or an affidavit, it is appropriate to submit an unsworn declaration in the form set forth in 28 U.S.C. § 1746.

F. Filing an Amended Complaint

A party may amend its pleading once as a matter of course within: (a) 21 days after serving it; or (b) if the pleading is one to which a responsive pleading is required, 21 days after service of a responsive pleading, or 21 days after service of a motion under Rule 12(b), (e) or (f), whichever is earlier.

G. Class Action Complaints - Local Rule 23.1

Class action complaints must bear next to their caption, the legend, “Complaint – Class Action.” In addition, they must set forth certain “Class Action Allegations” which are described in Local Civil Rule 23.1.

H. Copies of Complaints

It is not necessary to deliver multiple copies of the complaint and amended complaint to the Clerk’s Office to be served on the defendants. It is only necessary to deliver an original complaint or an original amended complaint for filing. The Clerk’s Office will process all completed summonses and return them to counsel for service on the opposing party.

I. Service of Process

Defendants have 21 days after the service of the summons and complaint to file an answer to the complaint unless otherwise ordered by the court.

The U.S. Attorney has 60 days after service to file an answer to the complaint in actions against the United States of America, an office or agency thereof.

J. Waiver of Service of Summons

Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires certain parties to cooperate in saving cost of the service of summons and complaint. A defendant who, after being notified of an action and asked to waive service of summons, fails to do so, will be required to bear the cost of such service unless good cause is shown for its failure to sign and return the waiver.

It is not good cause for a failure to waive service that a party believes that the complaint is unfounded, or that the action has been brought in an improper place or in a court that lacks jurisdiction over the subject matter of the action or over its person or property. A party who waives service of the summons retains all defenses and objections (except relating to the summons or to the service of the summons), and may later object to the jurisdiction of the court or to the place where the action has been brought.

A defendant who waives service must, within the time specified on the waiver form, serve on the plaintiff's attorney (or unrepresented party) a response to the complaint and must also file a signed copy of the response with the court. If the answer or motion is not served within this time, a default judgment may be taken against the defendant. By waiving service, a defendant is allowed more time to answer than if the summons had been actually served when the request for waiver of service was received.

If you need additional information on filing complaints contact Rick Sabol, Operations Manager, at (267) 299-7011.

DOCUMENTS

The original docket sheets, record files, and indices to all cases are available for inspection in the Clerk's Office, Room 2609, in Philadelphia or in Suite 1601 of the divisional office in Allentown. The civil dockets are divided among ten (10) clerks and the *last* digit of each case number determines the docket clerk to whom the case is assigned for processing.

The following personnel perform case processing duties in the civil section in the Philadelphia Clerk's Office:

(#1)	Rob Fehrle	(267) 299-7001
(#2)	Kirk Kopacz	(267) 299-7002
(#3)	Tom Giambrone.....	(267) 299-7003
(#4)	Tashia Irving	(267) 299-7004
(#5)	Kimberly Williams	(267) 299-7005
(#6)	Michele Helmer	(267) 299-7006
(#7)	Joseph Lavin	(267) 299-7007
(#8)	Ashley Mastrangelo	(267) 299-7008
(#9)	Steve Gill	(267) 299-7009
(#10)	Frank DelCampo	(267) 299-7010

At the divisional office in Allentown, Pennsylvania, contact:

Evelyn Renner	(610) 434-3896
Matthew A. Sheetz	(610) 776-6116
Kris Yerry	(610) 776-6115
Lauren Sampson	(610) 776-6121

Criminal case processing is divided among clerks:

Angela Burge	(267) 299-7160
James Hamilton	(267) 299-7024
Kevin Eibel.....	(267) 299-7035
Mark Ciamachelo	(267) 299-7145

Carlos Cardona at (267) 299-7023, reviews overall compliance with the Speedy Trial Act. The Magistrate Judges' Docket Clerk is Mark Ciamachelo at (267) 299-7145.

Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires that every pleading, motion and other paper of a party represented by an attorney be signed by the attorney. Please be sure to date the pleadings, attach a certificate of service, and include the address and phone number of counsel. It is not necessary to send a cover letter when filing routine pleadings. However, if you are filing a pleading which requires special attention, please include a cover letter.

The user log-in and password required to submit documents to the ECF system serves as the ECF Filing User's signature on all electronic documents filed with the court. They also serve as a signature for purposes of Rule 11(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Rules of this court, and any other purpose for which a signature is required in connection with proceedings before the court. Each document filed electronically must, if possible, indicate that it has been electronically filed.

Electronically filed documents must include a signature block and must set forth the name, address, telephone number and the attorney's state bar identification number, if applicable. In addition, the name of the ECF Filing User under whose log-in and password the document is submitted must be preceded by an "s/" and typed in the space where the signature would otherwise appear. Documents requiring signatures of more than one party must be electronically filed either by:

- (1) submitting a scanned document containing all necessary signatures;
- (2) representing the consent of the other parties on the document;
- (3) identifying on the document the parties whose signatures are required and by the submission of a notice of endorsement by the other parties no later than three (3) business days after filing; or
- (4) any other manner approved by the court.

A. Copies of Paper Documents

For filing paper documents, a disk in PDF format of all motions, memoranda and briefs is needed, accompanied by a courtesy copy. We suggest you do not combine pleadings, but file a separate pleading for each action in which a resolution is sought. When filing individual pleadings, it is easier and more efficient for the judge to have the option to sign an order ruling on the individual pleading rather than have to prepare an order.

It is important that pleadings be assembled with all documents in support thereof attached in sets. This ensures proper filing and also enables the judge to have complete sets.

Note: The Clerk's Office does not date-stamp copies of pleadings unless accompanied by self-addressed, stamped envelopes.

B. Certificate of Service

When filing pleadings, it is necessary to attach a ***Certificate of Service*** indicating the names of all counsel and/or parties you have served.

When an ECF Filing User electronically files a pleading or other document using the ECF system, a Notice of Electronic Case Filing shall automatically be generated by the system, and shall be sent automatically to all parties entitled to service under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure and the Local Rules of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania who have consented to electronic service. Electronic service of the Notice of Electronic Case Filing constitutes service of the filed document to all such parties and shall be deemed to satisfy the requirements of Rule 5(b)(2)(D) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Rule 49 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

All documents filed using the ECF system shall contain a Certificate of Service stating the document has been filed electronically and is available for viewing and downloading from the ECF system. The Certificate of Service must identify the manner in which service on each party was accomplished, including any party who has not consented to electronic service.

C. Third-Party Complaint

Leave of court is not necessary to file a third-party complaint if it is filed by the defendant within 14 days after service of the original answer to the complaint. However, leave of court is necessary if the defendant files the third-party complaint after the expiration of 14 days of the service of the answer. Counsel must file a *Motion for Leave to File a Third-Party Complaint*, together with a memorandum, proposed order and the proposed third-party complaint. When the judge signs the order, the clerk will process the complaint. **(See Rule 14, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.)**

D. Excluded Personal Identifiers – Local Rule of Civil Procedure 5.1.3

As documents in civil cases may be available for personal inspection in the office of the clerk at the United States Courthouse, or, if filed electronically, may be made available on the court's Electronic Case Filing system, such personal identifiers as Social Security numbers, dates of birth, financial account numbers and names of minor children should be modified or partially redacted in all documents filed either in traditional form or electronically. (*Appendix J*).

E. Electronic Case File Privacy – Local Rule of Criminal Procedure 53.2

In compliance with the policy of the Judicial Conference of the United States and the E-Government Act of 2002, and in order to promote electronic access to documents in the criminal case files while also protecting personal privacy and other legitimate interests, parties shall refrain from including, or shall partially redact where inclusion is necessary, the following personal data identifiers from all documents filed with the court, including exhibits thereto, whether filed electronically or in paper format, unless otherwise ordered by the court:

- (1) Social Security Numbers. If an individual's Social Security number must be included, only the last four digits of that number should be used.
- (2) Names of Minor Children. If the involvement of a minor child must be mentioned, only the initials of the child should be used.
- (3) Dates of Birth. If an individual's date of birth must be included, only the year should be used.
- (4) Financial Account Numbers. If financial account numbers are relevant, only the last four digits of the number should be used.
- (5) Home Addresses. If a home address must be included, only the city and state should be listed.

In compliance with the E-Government Act of 2002, a party wishing to file a document containing the personal data identifiers listed above may file an unredacted document under seal. This document shall be retained by the court as part of the record.

The court may, however, still require the party to file a redacted copy for the public file. Trial exhibits may be safeguarded by means other than redaction, and the court may modify this rule to fit the requirements of particular cases.

The responsibility for redacting these personal identifiers rests solely with counsel and the parties. The Clerk need not review filings for compliance with this rule.

F. Sealed Pleadings

Sealed cases and documents ordered to be placed under seal are excluded from the provisions of the ECF Procedures (**Appendix A**) and must be filed in paper format, filed in the traditional manner, and not electronically. A motion to file documents under seal may be filed electronically unless prohibited by law. A paper copy of the order must be attached to the documents under seal to be delivered to the Clerk of Court. Include a cover letter identifying the contents of the envelope and information pertaining to the sealing of the document and/or case. The envelope containing the sealed pleading should reflect the caption and case number and should also identify the type of pleading contained in the envelope. If a document is being filed and sealed pursuant to a protective order or other order, refer to the sealed document in your cover letter. Please include the word “SEALED” near the top margin of the letter to alert the person opening the mail to exercise caution in processing the envelope.

Local Rule of Civil Procedure 5.1.5 provides that a document in a civil action may be filed under seal only if:

- (1) the civil action is brought pursuant to a federal statute that prescribes the sealing of the record or of certain specific documents; or
- (2) the Court orders the documents sealed.

Where a document is sealed pursuant to § 5.1.5(a)(1), the continued status of the document under seal shall be governed by the relevant federal statute. If no federal statute governs, §§ 5.1.5(b)(2) and (c) shall apply.

When a document is sealed pursuant to § 5.1.5(a)(2), the document, if it remains in the custody of the Court, shall not be unsealed for two years after the conclusion of the civil action, including all appeals, unless the Court orders otherwise.

If a document is still sealed at the conclusion of the two-year period and the Court has not entered an order continuing its sealed status beyond that time, the Clerk of Court shall notify the attorney for the party having submitted the sealed document at the attorney's address on the docket that the document will be unsealed unless the attorney or the submitting party advises the Clerk within sixty (60) days that said attorney or submitting party objects. If the attorney or submitting party objects to the unsealing of the document, or if the Clerk's notification is returned unclaimed, the Court will make a determination on a case-by-case basis, whether to maintain the document under seal, to unseal it, or to require further notification.

G. False Claims Act Cases

All False Claims Act cases are opened by the docket clerk and filed *under seal*. The Complaint is docketed and no summons is issued. The Complaint is impounded and sent to the assigned judge.

The Government may file a number of motions for an extension of the seal on the False Claims Act cases. If the Government files a Notice of Election to Decline Intervention or Election to Intervene, it is docketed and forwarded to the Court. If there is a complaint or an amended complaint attached to the notice, it is also docketed and forwarded to the Court. A summons is never issued unless directed by the Court.

Only upon Court order is the complaint unsealed. At this point, the Court will issue an order directing the Clerk's Office and the U.S. Attorney's Office how to proceed.

H. Pleadings that are NOT Filed

The following pleadings are not filed pursuant to Local Civil Rule 26.1 – Discovery:

- Requests for Production of Documents;
- Requests for Admissions;
- Interrogatories;
- Answers to Interrogatories;
- Notices of Deposition; and
- Depositions.

I. Facsimile Transmission of Notice of Orders in Civil and Criminal Cases

Attorneys who do not register to participate in the ECF program are requested to register and participate in the Court's Program for Facsimile service of Notice to Counsel or Litigants in Civil and Criminal Cases (the "Fax Noticing Program"). This program allows attorneys and *pro se* litigants to waive the provisions of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 77(d) or Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 49(c), which requires service of Notice of Orders and Judgments by means of mail, and instead consent to receive Notice of Orders and Judgments by means of facsimile transmission.

Forms of Consent to Receive Notice of Orders and Judgments by means of Facsimile Transmission and Waiver of the Provisions of Fed.R.Civ.P. 77(d) or Fed.R.Crim.P. 49(c), providing for said Notice by means of mail are available through the Clerk's Office (**Appendix K**). Execution of the Facsimile Transmission Authorization form authorizes the Clerk of Court to serve notice of the entry of Orders and Judgments pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 77(d) or Fed.R.Crim.P. 49(c) by facsimile in lieu of notice by means of mail. The Facsimile Transmission Authorization form also serves as Notice to and Authorization for the Clerk of Court to keep your name and the relevant information on file so that the Facsimile Transmission Authorization form will apply to all pending and future civil and criminal cases in which the attorney or *pro se* litigant is, or will be, either counsel or a party to litigation.

The waiver of the provisions providing for notice of the entry of Orders or Judgments by mail will include all pending civil and criminal cases in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for the *pro se* litigant and all pending civil and criminal cases in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania in which the attorney either represents a party or is a party to the litigation, except for grand jury proceedings and impounded cases.

The Clerk of Court will make three attempts to transmit the Notice of Entry of Orders and Judgments by means of Facsimile. If after three attempts facsimile transmission is unsuccessful, Notice shall be made by means of mail pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 77(d) or Fed.R.Crim.P. 49(c).

J. Mail

The court, in its ongoing commitment to provide more timely notice and enhance the level of service to members of the bar, litigants and the public, has joined efforts with the U.S. Postal Service to implement procedures to streamline and facilitate the delivery and processing of mail directed to and from the U.S. Courthouse.

MAIL SENT TO COUNSEL

In order to expedite delivery of notices from judicial officers and the Clerk of Court, members of the bar are requested to furnish the following information by completing an Information Form (**Appendix L**): Name; Bar I.D. Number; Firm; Address; City; State; Zip Code and **4-digit extension number**; and Facsimile Number. Please return the completed form to the Clerk of Court at:

**Michael E. Kunz, Clerk of Court
United States District Court
For The Eastern District of Pennsylvania
U.S. Courthouse
601 Market Street, Room 2609
Philadelphia, PA 19106-1797**

or, by facsimile to: (215) 597-6390, (267) 299-7135 or (610) 434-6174.

MAIL SENT TO THE COURT

In order to take full advantage of these procedures, all mail sent to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania at 601 Market Street, Philadelphia, Pa and divisional office locations should include both the **zip code and 4-digit extension number**. Accordingly, all mail submitted to a judicial officer should be addressed as follows:

<p>(Name of Judicial Officer) United States District Court Eastern District of Pennsylvania U.S. Courthouse 601 Market Street, Room _____ Philadelphia, PA 19106-1797</p>	<p>Michael E. Kunz, Clerk of Court United States District Court Eastern District of Pennsylvania U.S. Courthouse 601 Market Street, Room 2609 Philadelphia, PA 19106-1797</p>
--	--

The use of bar coding technology that is currently available in word processing software packages for addressing envelopes is encouraged. A listing of the room numbers and Zip Code and 4-digit extension numbers of the judicial officers is available in the Clerk's Office. (**Appendix M**).

MOTIONS

An application to the court for an order (unless made during a hearing or trial) shall be made in writing stating with particularity the grounds therefor, and shall set forth the relief sought. [See Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 7(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 7.1(a).]

All motions shall contain a caption setting forth the name of the court, the title of the action, the file number, and a designation. [See Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 10(a).]

Every motion not certified as uncontested must be accompanied by a brief containing a concise statement of the legal contentions and authorities relied upon in support of the motion. Every motion shall be accompanied by a form of order which, if approved by the court, would grant the relief sought by the motion. Uncontested motions must be accompanied by a written statement as to the date and manner of service of the motion and supporting brief.

Every motion of a party represented by an attorney shall be signed by at least one attorney of record in the attorney's individual name, whose address shall be stated. A party who is not represented by an attorney shall sign each motion and state their correct address as indicated. [See Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 7(b)(3).]

A brief in opposition to the motion, together with such answer or other response as may be appropriate, is required if the served party opposes the motion.

The response to the motion must be made within fourteen (14) days after service of the motion and supporting brief: [See Local Rule 7.1(c)]

SUMMONS

Summonses shall be prepared by counsel (*Appendix N*). At the time of the filing of a complaint, all summonses shall be submitted to the Clerk of Court's Office for signature and seal. Each defendant's name, as it appears on the complaint (without its address), is to be typed on a summons and submitted to the deputy clerk. The original and sufficient copies for each defendant will be returned to counsel. To issue a second summons, file a Praecipe to Issue Alias Summons, naming the defendants.

JURISDICTION

The Eastern District of Pennsylvania includes the counties of Berks, Bucks, Chester, Delaware, Lancaster, Lehigh, Montgomery, Northampton and Philadelphia. Please take note that effective April 19, 1999, jurisdiction of the county of Schuylkill was transferred to the U.S.D.C. for the Middle District of Pennsylvania.

Court for the Eastern District is held at Philadelphia, Reading, Allentown and Easton. When it appears from the designation form filed by counsel, or from the complaint, petition, motion, answer, response, indictment, information or other pleading in a civil or criminal case, that a plaintiff or defendant resides in or that the accident, incident or transaction occurred in the counties of Berks, Lancaster, Lehigh or Northampton, said case shall be assigned for trial and pretrial procedures to a judge assigned to hear cases from Reading, Allentown or Easton.

All other cases, unless otherwise directed by the court, shall be tried in Philadelphia, and as each case is filed, assigned to a judge, who shall thereafter have charge of the case for all purposes. [See Local Civil Rule 40.1]

The Office of the Clerk of Court maintains two Clerks' Offices and accepts all filings in Philadelphia and Allentown, Pennsylvania at the following addresses:

<p>United States District Court Eastern District of Pennsylvania United States Courthouse 601 Market Street, Room 2609 Philadelphia, PA 19106-1797</p> <p>(215) 597-7704</p>	<p>United States District Court Edward N. Cahn United States Courthouse & Federal Building 504 West Hamilton Street, Suite 1601 Allentown, PA 18101-1500</p> <p>(610) 434-3896</p>
--	--

SUBPOENAS

**(Rule 45, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure as amended December, 1991
and Rule 17, Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure)**

A. Civil

Under Rule 45 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, attorneys are authorized to issue subpoenas in the name of any court in which they are authorized to practice, and in the case of a deposition or a production of documents taking place in another district, in the

name of the court where the deposition or the production is to take place. Attorneys issuing subpoenas must comply with the appropriate Federal Rules and Local Rules.

Although it is no longer necessary that subpoenas be issued by the Clerk, the Clerk still has the authority to do so. In those instances in which counsel elects to have the Clerk of Court issue the subpoena, an original and one copy is needed for each witness to be served. The requirement that a subpoena be issued under seal has been abolished.

For a foreign deposition (deposition being taken in a state other than Pennsylvania), subpoenas are issued in blank by the Clerk's office, completed and served by counsel. They are not signed by the court where the original notice to take the deposition is filed.

All subpoenas may be served by a person who is not a party and is not less than 18 years of age. There is no provision in the rules for subpoenas to be served by mail.

Pursuant to F.R.C.P. 45(b)(2), a subpoena may be served anywhere within the district. However, subpoenas may only be served outside the district if they are within 100 miles of the place designated in the subpoena for the deposition, trial, production of documents, hearing, or inspection. The federal rules also permit the service of a subpoena that is outside of the district, but within the state if certain conditions are met. See, F.R.C.P. 45(b)(2). All subpoenas must be accompanied by a check made payable to the witness for the witness fee (\$40 per day) and mileage (.555 cents per mile, round trip).

A copy of the subpoena is left with the witness and the original subpoena is returned to counsel.

B. Criminal

Under Rule 17 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, the Clerk of Court or the Magistrate Judge hearing the matter shall issue subpoenas. An original and one copy are needed for each witness to be served. All subpoenas issued by the Clerk are: (1) completed by counsel; (2) signed by the Clerk of Court; and (3) have the seal of the court placed over the name of the Clerk of Court before being served on the witness.

All subpoenas may be served by a person who is not a party and is not less than 18 years of age. There is no provision in the rules for subpoenas to be served by mail.

All subpoenas must be accompanied by a check made payable to the witness for the witness fee (\$40.00 per day) and mileage (.555 cents per mile, round trip), unless the subpoena was issued on behalf of the United States or the court has determined upon an *ex parte* motion that the defendant is financially unable to pay.

A criminal subpoena requiring the attendance of a witness at a hearing or trial may be served at any place within the United States. Subpoenas which are directed at witnesses in a foreign country shall be issued in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1783.

For more detailed information on criminal subpoenas, refer to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 17.

FOREIGN SUBPOENAS

(Rule 45, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure)

A foreign subpoena is one issued out of a court other than where the original case is pending. For example, a case is pending in California, but counsel would like to take the deposition of someone in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

A. Filing a Procedure in Out-of-State Court

Counsel should complete the subpoena forms, attach a check for the witness fee and mileage in the sum of \$40.00 per day, plus .555 cents per mile, round trip, and send them, together with the stamped copy of the notice to take the deposition, to the United States District Court nearest where the deponent resides. The referred court, where the deposition shall issue will stamp the name of the clerk, have the form signed by a deputy and affix the seal of its court over the signature.

B. Service

Service of the deposition subpoena must be by process server. There is no provision for service by mail. The subpoena is left with the witness, together with the witness fee. Counsel should make arrangements with a special process server for serving the subpoena.

C. To Contest

To contest a foreign (deposition) subpoena, file a motion to quash the deposition subpoena in the district where the subpoena was issued. File an original motion with the court. The case is filed as a miscellaneous case, with an associated filing fee of \$46.00.

D. Attendance

A person to whom a civil subpoena for the taking of a deposition is directed may be required to attend at any place within 100 miles from the place where the person resides, is employed or transacts business in person, is served, or at such other convenient place is fixed by an order of the court.

DISCOVERY

In accordance with Local Civil Rule 26.1, discovery material is not filed with the court. The party serving the discovery material or taking the deposition shall retain the original and be the custodian of it. Every motion governing discovery shall identify and set forth, verbatim, the relevant parts of the interrogatory, request, answer, response, objection, notice, subpoena or deposition. Any party responding to the motion shall set forth, verbatim, in that party's memorandum, any other part that the party believes necessary to the court's consideration of the motion.

TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER (T.R.O.)

The assigned judge will set a time (usually the same day you file the T.R.O.) to meet with you and opposing counsel, if any. File the case in the Clerk's Office and give the clerk sufficient time to assemble the case for the judge and prepare the docket. If the judge grants the temporary restraining order, it is the responsibility of counsel for plaintiff to make service of the T.R.O. on the defendant.

We suggest you call Rick Sabol, the Operations Manager, at (267) 299-7011 with any questions.

WRITS OF GARNISHMENT, ATTACHMENT AND EXECUTION

Writs of Garnishment and Attachment are prepared by counsel, filed with the Clerk's Office for processing and served by the U.S. Marshal. Counsel is responsible for notice to opposing counsel. Notice must be given to all owners of the property. (*Appendix O*).

You must wait 14 days before you can execute on a judgment, unless a Motion to Vacate, Motion to Stay, Motion for Reconsideration, or Motion for a New Trial is pending. If counsel requests, we will process the Praecipe for a Writ of Garnishment or Execution immediately, referring the matter to the assigned judge, if available, or to the judge's chambers for guidance. (See, Rule 62, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure).

FILING A JUDGMENT BY DEFAULT

A. Rule 55(a), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure

You must file a request with the Clerk for the entry of a default for want of answer or other defense. Set forth the following information: (1) defendant was properly served

on a particular date; (2) the time for defendant to file an answer to the complaint has expired; (3) that as of the date of the filing of the request for entry of the default, no answer (or motion to dismiss or motion for summary judgment) has been filed; and (4) instruct the Clerk to enter a default against the defendant (name the defendant if more than one in a case) for want of answer or other defense.

If the defendant is an individual, be sure that the defendant was served a copy of the complaint by either special process server, or waiver of service provisions of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 4(d) or otherwise in accordance with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 4.

B. Rule 55(b), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure

To file a request for judgment by default for an individual, file an affidavit indicating the individual is (1) not an infant; (2) not incompetent; (3) not in the military; (4) amount due and owing; and (5) form of judgment.

To file a request for judgment by default for a corporation, file only an affidavit of amount due. If the amount requested in the complaint differs from that requested in the proposed judgment, the affidavit of amount due should explain the discrepancy.

MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

Due to the volume of litigants and the complexity of procedural requirements, those cases that are classified as being multidistrict litigation are governed by a separate and unique set of procedural rules. These rules are contained in the **Procedural Manual for Multidistrict Litigation**. Counsel may review this manual in the Clerk's Office, Room 2609, or may purchase copies from the Multidistrict Litigation Panel in Washington, D.C. Specific requests for information and related inquiries should be directed to Jeffrey N. Luthi, Clerk of the Panel, Multidistrict Litigation Panel, One Columbus Circle, N.E., Suite G-255, North Lobby, Washington, D.C. 20002-8004 or at (202) 502-2800.

On July 29, 1991, the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation entered an opinion and order transferring all asbestos cases that were not on trial and were pending outside the Eastern District of Pennsylvania to this Court and assigned them to the late Honorable Charles R. Weiner for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407, MDL 875, In Re: Asbestos Products Liability Litigation. MDL 875 has been reassigned to the Honorable Eduardo C. Robreno. The deputy clerk with general responsibility for local involvement in multidistrict litigation matters is Tom Dempsey, at (267) 299-7018.

ARBITRATION

Our arbitration program provides litigants with a more prompt and less expensive alternative to the traditional courtroom trial. It has been in operation since 1978 and includes all civil cases (except social security cases, cases in which a prisoner is a party, cases alleging a violation of a constitutional right and cases where jurisdiction is based on 28 U.S.C. § 1343) where money damages only are sought in an amount not exceeding \$150,000. Counsel is advised to refer to Local Civil Rule 53.2 for the specific types and categories of cases that are considered to be eligible for arbitration.

A. Procedure for Cases Eligible for Arbitration

When a complaint is filed, our local civil rule provides that damages are presumed to be not in excess of \$150,000 unless counsel certifies that the damages exceed that amount. Immediately after the answer is filed, the attorneys receive a letter from the Clerk's Office advising them of the date for the arbitration hearing and also notifying them that discovery must be completed within 90 days. The clerk schedules the arbitration hearing for a specific day, usually a date about four months after an answer has been filed. In the event a party files a motion for judgment on the pleadings, summary judgment, or similar relief, our local rule provides that the case may not be heard until the court has ruled on the motion. However, the filing of a motion after the judge designates the arbitrators who will hear the case (usually about 30 days prior to the arbitration hearing) shall not stay the arbitration unless the judge so orders.

B. Trial Procedure

Although the Federal Rules of Evidence are designated as guides for the admissibility of evidence at the arbitration hearing, copies of photographs of exhibits must be marked for identification and delivered to the adverse party at least ten (10) days prior to arbitration. The arbitrators shall receive such exhibits in evidence without formal proof, unless counsel has been notified at least five (5) days prior to the hearing that their opponent intends to raise an issue concerning the authenticity of the exhibit. The arbitration hearing is not recorded unless a party, at their own expense, arranges for a recording. The arbitrators are authorized to change the date of the arbitration hearing, provided it takes place within thirty (30) days of the date originally scheduled.

C. Arbitrators

We currently have over 1500 lawyers certified as arbitrators. In order to qualify for certification, the lawyer must be admitted to practice before our court, be a member of the bar for at least five (5) years, and be determined by our Chief Judge to be competent to perform the duties of an arbitrator. An arbitrator receives \$150 for each case arbitrated. Three arbitrators are appointed for each case. They are randomly selected by the Clerk and

each panel of three arbitrators is composed of one whose practice is primarily representing plaintiffs, one whose practice is primarily representing defendants, and one whose practice does not fit either category. The arbitrators are scheduled for hearing dates several months in advance. However, it is not until the judge signs the order designating the arbitrators who will hear the case (approximately 30 days prior to the arbitration hearing) that counsel learn the identity of the arbitrators and the arbitrators become aware of the a case assigned to them.

D. Arbitrator's Award

Immediately after the hearing, the arbitrators make a simple award, e.g., "Award in favor of defendant" or "Award in favor of plaintiff" in the amount of \$ XXX against (naming one or more defendants). The arbitrators are instructed that they should not file findings of fact, conclusions of law, nor opinions of any kind. The arbitrator's award shall be entered as the final judgment of the Court, unless within 30 days of the filing of the award a party demands a trial de novo.

E. Demands for Trial De Novo

Upon the filing of a demand for trial de novo, the case proceeds as if it had never been heard by the arbitrators.

APPEALS

A. Civil

In civil cases, you have 30 days to file an appeal, unless the government is a party, in which case you have 60 days. The time commences from the date the order or judgment is entered on the docket (calendar days, not working days). A cross appeal should be filed 14 days from the filing of the first appeal.

All cases filed in the ECF System in which a notice of appeal is filed shall be governed by Rule 10 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure and relevant Local Rules and internal operating procedures of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, with any differences about whether the record truly discloses what occurred in the district court to be submitted to and settled by the judge. Cases in which there is a right of direct appeal to the United States Supreme Court shall be governed by the rules of the United States Supreme Court.

For cases filed in paper format, an original notice of appeal, a copy for each counsel of record, a copy for the Third Circuit Court of Appeals and a copy for the District Court Judge are needed.

B. Criminal

In criminal cases you have 14 days to file an appeal. Cross appeals should also be filed within 14 days.

For cases filed in paper format, an original notice of appeal, a copy for all counsel of record, a copy for the Third Circuit Court of Appeals and a copy for the District Court Judge are needed. Also needed is the Clerk's Information Sheet concerning criminal cases in which a notice of appeal is filed.

If the attorney is court-appointed, pursuant to the provisions of the Criminal Justice Act, a filing fee is not required.

C. Report and Recommendation of U.S. Magistrate Judge

A party has 14 days to file objections. An original and one copy are required.

D. Bankruptcy

A party has 14 days to file a bankruptcy appeal to the District Court. This appeal is filed in the Bankruptcy Court. An original and copies for all counsel of record are required. Counsel must file designation of record on appeal (Bankruptcy's Rule 8006).

E. Patent, "Little Tucker Act" and Claims Court Transfer Cases

Appeals in patent and "Little Tucker Act" cases [28 U.S.C. §§ 1295(a)(1)-(2)] from certain interlocutory orders in these cases [28 U.S.C. § 1295(c)], and from orders transferring or refusing to transfer cases to the United States Claims Court [28 U.S.C. § 1292(d)(4)(B)], go to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. Federal Circuit Rules, practice notes, and appendix of forms are found in the Rules of Practice Before the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, available from the Clerk of that Court upon request. Call (202) 633-6550 or write to: 717 Madison Place, N.W., Washington, DC 20439.

F. Service

Appellate Rule 25(c) outlines the procedures for service of the notice of appeal.

The Clerk of Court is responsible for serving a copy of the notice of appeal by mail / e-mail to counsel of record other than the appellant. The date the notice of appeal was filed is noted on each copy served. A notation is made on the docket by the clerk of the names of the parties to whom copies are mailed and the date of mailing.

G. Filing Fee

The \$5 filing fee for the notice of appeal and the \$500 docket fee for the Court of Appeals are tendered to the Clerk of Court at the time of filing the notice of appeal. If the fee is not paid within 14 days after the docketing, the clerk is authorized to dismiss the appeal.

H. Preparation of the Record on Appeal

Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure provide for certification and transmittal of the original district court records file and exhibits to the Court of Appeals. However, the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit has initiated an experimental program for retention of records in the district courts. In order to monitor record and case management, the district courts have been directed to retain the court records and to transmit to the Court of Appeals a certified copy of the docket entries in lieu of the entire record.

However, Rule 11 of the Third Circuit Rules provides that all reinstated parts of the record are to be transmitted if any party or the court requests such at any time during the pendency of the proceeding.

Rule 11 requires the appellant within 14 days after filing of the notice of appeal, to order from the court reporter, a transcript of the proceedings not already on file that the appellant deems necessary for inclusion in the record (*Appendix P*). Rule 11 of the Third Circuit Rules also requires that a deposit be made with the court reporter of the estimated cost of transcript.

Any questions you may have concerning appeals should be directed to Orlando Medina, Jr., at (267) 299-7015.

CERTIFICATION OF JUDGEMENT (AO 451)

Check Appellate Rule 4(a)(4) before issuing an AO 451. Also check the docket sheet for any post-judgment motions which may have the effect of “staying” the execution on the judgment.

The clerk does not have the authority to issue an AO 451 if a Motion to Vacate the Judgment, Motion for Reconsideration or Motion to Stay is pending or unless the “appeal time” has expired, except when ordered by the court that entered the judgment for good cause shown. (28 U.S.C. § 1963, as amended). The appeal time commences to run from the date the judgment is entered on the docket, unless otherwise ordered by the Court. The clerk is not authorized to issue an AO 451 before the expiration of the appeal time because the case may be “reversed” on appeal and result in substantial loss to plaintiff because of the executions on the property of the defendant.

Normally, all civil cases may be appealed within 30 days from the date of entry of the final judgment on the docket. The United States always has 60 days within which to file an appeal. Be sure to attach a certified copy of the judgment to the AO 451 form.

REFERRAL TO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) and Local Civil Rule 72.1, U.S. Magistrate Judges may conduct, upon consent of all the parties in a civil case, any or all proceedings, including a jury or non-jury trial, and order the entry of a final judgment.

Your decision to consent, or not to consent, to the referral of your case to a U.S. Magistrate Judge for disposition is entirely voluntary and should be communicated solely to the Clerk of Court. Appropriate consent forms for this purpose are available from the Clerk's Office (***Appendix Q***).

Only if all the parties in the case consent to the referral to a magistrate judge will either the district court judge or the magistrate judge be informed of your decision. The judge will then decide whether or not to refer the case to a magistrate judge for disposition, but no action eligible for arbitration will be referred by consent of the parties until the arbitration has been concluded and trial *de novo* demanded pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2. The court may, for good cause shown on its motion, or under extraordinary circumstances shown by any party, vacate a referral of a civil matter to a magistrate judge.

When a case is referred to a magistrate judge for all further proceedings, including the entry of final judgment, the final judgment may be appealed directly to the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, unless the parties elect to have the case reviewed by the appropriate district judge (in which event any further appeal to the Court of Appeals would only be by petition for leave to appeal). (See Local Civil Rule 721.).

POST JUDGMENT INTEREST RATE

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1961 and 40 U.S.C. § 258, interest shall be allowed on any money judgment in a civil case recovered in a district court. Execution therefor may be levied by the marshal, in any case where, by the law of the State in which such court is held, execution may be levied for interest on judgments recovered in the courts of the State. Such interest shall be calculated from the date of the entry of the judgment, at a rate equal to the weekly average 1-year constant maturity Treasury yield, as published by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, for the calendar week preceding the date of the judgment. Requests for the current rate and any questions should be directed to Richard Sabol, Operations Manager, at (267) 299-7011 or Terry Milano, Assistant Operations Manager, at (267) 299-7013. Current rates are available through a link to the Federal Reserve from our website: <http://www.paed.uscourts.gov>.

**TAXATION OF COSTS
BY THE
CLERK OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

AUGUST 7, 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

- A. NORMALLY ALLOWABLE DISTRICT COURT COSTS IN GENERAL**
- B. NORMALLY UNALLOWABLE DISTRICT COURT COSTS IN GENERAL**
- C. BURDEN OF PROOF REGARDING NORMALLY ALLOWABLE DISTRICT COURT COSTS**
- D. GENERAL OBJECTIONS TO NORMALLY ALLOWABLE DISTRICT COURT COSTS IN THEIR ENTIRETY**
- E. SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS TO NORMALLY ALLOWABLE DISTRICT COURT**
- F. SPECIAL PROCEDURES FOR ALLOWANCE OF DISTRICT COURT COSTS IN SITUATIONS INVOLVING FEDERAL RULE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 68**
- G. TAXATION OF APPELLATE COURT COSTS AND SUPREME COURT COSTS BY THE CLERK OF THE DISTRICT COURT**

A. Normally Allowable District Court Costs in General

It is well-established that district court costs may not be imposed in federal district courts except where they are authorized by either a statute or a rule of court.¹ Excluding from the discussion those district court costs taxable pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 68 (which will be discussed in Section F of this manual), and certain narrowly-defined appellate court costs which are taxable by the district court (which will be discussed in Section G of this manual), federal district court costs are governed by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d).² The text of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d) is divided into two sections:

- Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(2), which by its own terms governs ***“Attorney’s Fees;”*** and
- Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(1), which by its own terms governs ***“(District Court) Costs Other Than Attorney’s Fees.”***

All of those “(District Court) Costs Other Than Attorney’s Fees” made taxable by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(1) are listed in 28 U.S.C. § 1920,³ and the Clerk has authority to tax those types of district court costs which are listed in 28 U.S.C. § 1920 in favor of the prevailing party or parties, and against the non-prevailing party or parties.⁵ (Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(1) costs may be assessed by the Clerk even when attorney fees pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(2) are disallowed by the presiding judge).⁶

Those items of district court costs taxable in the first instance by the Clerk, as listed in 28 U.S.C. § 1920, are:

- “(1) Fees of the clerk or 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 cost 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).”

The prevailing party, having had judgment entered in its favor, may file a bill of costs seeking any of the items authorized by 28 U.S.C. § 1920.

A bill of costs must be supported by an affidavit pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1924, stating that the costs sought were both actually incurred and necessarily incurred.⁷

It is generally advisable for the prevailing party to not file a bill of costs until after any appeals are decided, or until after any period for filing appeals, or for filing post-trial motions, expires, so that if any additional costs are incurred, the bill of costs will not have to be amended.⁸

The bill of costs will then be forwarded to the deputy clerk responsible for taxation of costs.

The section of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(1) requiring fourteen days' notice simply means that *at least fourteen days* must elapse between the filing of the bill of costs and the taxing of costs; as a practical matter, it is usually necessary in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for much more than fourteen days to process a taxation of costs request pursuant to § 1920 and these procedures. Costs will not be taxed until the underlying litigation is completed, and until after any period in which an appeal may be raised has lapsed; this is based on the simple principle that until the underlying litigation is over, the issue of who is the ultimately "prevailing party" has not yet been determined.⁹ Once the issue of who is the ultimately prevailing party has been finally determined, the clerk shall send letters to both parties (or their counsel) asking for objections in writing from the non-prevailing party within fourteen (14) days, with the prevailing party then having fourteen (14) days to respond in writing. Local Rule of Civil Procedure 5.1(b) requires all counsel and any pro se litigants to provide the Clerk with an address for purposes of notices and service; the aforesaid letter will therefore be mailed to counsel (or to a pro se litigant) at their last known addresses, which constitutes proper and valid service upon them (pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5(b)(2)(C)) (it is for this reason that in the event that any of these letters are returned to the Clerk by the Postal Service as undeliverable, that the Clerk will not conduct any further investigation to find a current address for any of these persons).

All of the aforesaid objections and all of the aforesaid responses to the objections must be made by means of a court filing (letters shall not suffice).

In order to avoid the possibility of the Clerk entering a taxation opinion which may possibly have to be vacated at a later point in time, the Clerk will delay the taxing of costs until after all appeals have been exhausted¹⁰ (or, until after the time period for filing an appeal has lapsed).¹¹

The Clerk will make a determination based on the bill of costs itself, and the arguments made in writing (if any); in addition, any relevant statutes, rules of court, and/or case law may play a role in the Clerk's determination of whether district court costs should be taxed and, if warranted, in what amount.

After making his determination, the Clerk will thereafter enter a written taxation of costs opinion, accompanied, if warranted, by a judgment. A true and correct copy of the taxation opinion and any attached judgment shall be forwarded to all parties of record, or their counsel. Costs are effective as of the date the Clerk's judgment is entered on the docket. Either party can appeal the Clerk's taxation opinion and/or judgment to the presiding Article III judicial officer within seven (7) days, pursuant to F.R.C.P. 54(d)(1) (this seven day period is not jurisdictional, and the court has discretion to consider any untimely appeal of Clerk's taxation opinion and/or judgment in the event of "excusable neglect" on the part of the appealing party).¹²

B. Normally Unallowable District Court Costs in General

Normally, the Clerk will tailor his taxation of costs opinion around the items requested and the actual objections raised by the losing party or parties, and will not raise issues *sua sponte*; however, as stated previously, since the Clerk's power is strictly limited by 28 U.S.C. § 1920, a necessary corollary is that if a requested item is never authorized by 28 U.S.C. § 1920 under any circumstances, the Clerk may not tax that item as a 28 U.S.C. § 1920 cost, even where the losing party or parties have not raised any objections to the item or items in question.

Congress has provided for the assessment of attorney fees by means of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(2); as they are not specifically listed in 28 U.S.C. § 1920, attorney fees are clearly not taxable pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(1).¹⁴ Pursuant to the language of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d) itself, attorney fees are only recoverable from the presiding judge pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(2), and not from the Clerk pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(1). An Award or disallowance of attorney fees pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(2) is totally separate and distinct from an award of statutory costs pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(1).¹⁵ The rationale supporting this standard is that unlike attorney fees, an assessment of 28 U.S.C. § 1920 costs is considered to be purely ministerial, and is not considered to be punitive toward the non-prevailing party, but merely as reimbursement to the prevailing party for their costs in bringing a successful civil action¹⁶ (whereas an assessment of attorney fees is considered to be punitive).¹⁷

In addition, those litigation costs which are more closely associated with the routine overhead of practicing law than with the types of district court costs listed in 28 U.S.C. § 1920 are not taxable pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(1), as they are seen as analogous to attorney fees.¹⁸ (The fact that counsel did not perform the actual

work leading to an unallowable item of cost, but was charged with it by an “evidence” provider as a condition of obtaining evidence, or by a stenographer, as a condition of obtaining a transcript, does not change the fact that the item is not listed in 28 U.S.C. § 1920 and is therefore unallowable).¹⁹

By this standard, costs which are not, even arguably among those types of district court costs listed in 28 U.S.C. § 1920, include:

- (1) the costs of attorney work product, such as pleadings, motions, memoranda and briefs, as well as case-related correspondence.²⁰ (Although costs related to the production of exact copies²¹ of original documentary evidence²² such as records²³ as taxable under 28 U.S.C. § 1920, we repeat once again that costs of attorney work product are not taxable under that statute; therefore, the prevailing party must be able to explain what types of documents were copied when requesting the taxing of these types of costs);²⁴
- (2) the costs of attorney court-admission fees (including court fees for admission “pro hac vice.”)²⁵ “Mediation fees” are also not taxable pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1920;²⁶
- (3) The costs of law firm rent, the costs of law firm utilities and costs for any and all non-attorney law firm staffing,²⁷ such as the costs of paralegals²⁸ and the costs of secretarial services²⁹ (including the costs of typing³⁰ and the costs of word processing);³¹
- (4) attorney travel expenses³² (including attorney airfare,³³ attorney meals,³⁴ attorney lodging,³⁵ attorney parking³⁶ and attorney car rentals).³⁷ Accordingly, these costs are prohibited in a Clerk’s Taxation of Costs. (Travel expenses for a witness, unlike travel expenses for an attorney, are, at least arguably, taxable by the Clerk pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1920(3)).³⁸
- (5) costs related to legal research;³⁹
- (6) telephone expenses⁴⁰ (including both long distance and local telephone calls);⁴¹
- (7) costs related to the use of the facsimile machines;⁴²
- (8) costs of courier, local delivery and/or messenger services.⁴³ (We hasten to point out that this standard does not apply to costs for governmental service of process or private service of process, which may be taxed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1920(1));⁴⁴
- (9) postage costs;⁴⁵

- (10) costs of shipping and handling (including shipping and handling by means of the “United Parcel Service” or by means of “Federal Express.”);⁴⁶
- (11) fees paid to a special master;⁴⁷
- (12) the costs of investigative services;⁴⁸
- (13) costs related to the preparation of an expert’s testimony or report,⁴⁹ including costs related to an Independent Medical Examination.⁵⁰ (Although expert witness fees may be allowable in some situations pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1920(3) and/or 28 U.S.C. § 1920(6));
- (14) case-related work performed by accounting professionals;⁵¹
- (15) the cost of telegrams;⁵²
- (16) unexplained requests for “miscellaneous” costs;⁵³

C. Burden of Proof Regarding Normally Allowable District Court Costs

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(1) directs that “(district court) costs – other than attorney fees” (i.e. those costs authorized by 28 U.S.C. § 1920⁵⁴ “*should* be allowed to the prevailing party (emphasis added).” This language is evidence of “specific intent”⁵⁵ on the part of Congress that there should be a heavy presumption⁵⁶ that “the ‘prevailing party’ *automatically* is entitled to costs”⁵⁷ as a matter of course, once it has been shown that the costs sought are, at least arguably, of those types of costs listed in 28 U.S.C. § 1920,⁵⁸ provided that those costs were both *actually incurred* (as evidenced by a sworn affidavit)⁵⁹ and *necessarily incurred* (“necessarily” meaning that the costs were reasonably incurred for the prevailing party’s effective preparation, judged in light of the situation existing when the costs in question were actually incurred, without regard to whether the costs relate to items which were actually used).⁶⁰

The rationale supporting this heavy presumption is that unlike attorney fees, an assessment of 28 U.S.C. § 1920 costs is considered to be purely ministerial, and is not considered to be punitive toward the non-prevailing party or parties, but merely as reimbursement to the prevailing party or parties for their costs in bringing or pursuing a successful civil action⁶¹ (whereas an assessment of attorney fees *is* considered to be punitive).⁶² A consequence of this heavy presumption is that the non-prevailing party or parties bear the burden of proof, and must overcome the aforesaid heavy presumption in favor of the taxing of district court costs against that non-prevailing party or parties.⁶³ Because of this heavy presumption, it is considered punitive towards the prevailing party or parties to deny to that prevailing party or parties district court costs which are ordinarily automatically taxed under 28 U.S.C. § 1920,⁶⁴ and it is not necessary for the prevailing party or parties to argue that the non-prevailing party or parties did something that was wrong or inappropriate.⁶⁵

As a further result of the aforesaid heavy presumption, in the event taxable district court costs are denied to the prevailing party or parties, the Clerk must specifically state what defect, bad act or impropriety on the part of that prevailing party or parties leads the Clerk to deny to that prevailing party or parties otherwise allowable costs.⁶⁶

As the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit appropriately noted in 2010, it is for precisely these reasons that counsel should always advise each client, before commencing the litigation process, that in the event that their litigation is unsuccessful, that there is a risk of taxation of district court costs against that client pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1920.⁶⁷

D. General Objections to Normally Allowable District Court Costs in Their Entirety

(1) *Alleged Pretrial Stipulation*

It is well-settled law that if the parties to a civil action have stipulated prior to the final judgment in the underlying lawsuit as to how district court costs will be apportioned or taxed, that stipulation is controlling, if a bill of costs is ultimately filed.⁶⁸ In situations where the parties disagree on this issue, it is important to recall that the Clerk has no fact-finding mechanism; accordingly, the Clerk must not address this general objection, and will proceed to tax costs as if there was no pre-judgment stipulation between the parties as to how these costs would be apportioned; if any party is not satisfied with this result, they can appeal the Taxation Opinion and the accompanying Judgment to the trial judge.⁶⁹ (A Clerk's Taxation of Costs proceeding is not a forum for re-examining the underlying facts of the lawsuit or for re-litigating the underlying lawsuit).⁷⁰

(2) *Alleged Economic Disparity Between the Parties*

According to a 2010 decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, economic disparity between the parties is an objection that this clerk and/or this court "**may not consider**."⁷¹

To go into further detail, we note that Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(1) directs that "costs – other than attorney fees" (i.e. those costs authorized by 28 U.S.C. § 1920) "**should** be allowed to the prevailing party (emphasis added)." This language is evidence of "specific intent"⁷² on the part of Congress that there should be a heavy presumption⁷³ that "the 'prevailing' party automatically is entitled to costs⁷⁴ as a matter of course, once it has been shown that the costs sought are, at least arguably, of those types of costs listed in 28 U.S.C. § 1920.⁷⁵ We are therefore of the view that the Clerk has no discretion to disallow otherwise allowable costs based on an argument rooted in economics; economic disparity between the parties is not a basis for disallowing costs, and a very strong presumption exists that consideration of the equities does not favor a disallowance of costs by the court.⁷⁶ The Clerk may tax costs not only where the losing party is less affluent than the prevailing party, but also where the losing party is actually

indigent.⁷⁷ Even complete and utter inability to pay is not grounds for a disallowance of costs.⁷⁸ Likewise, even the granting of in forma pauperis status to the losing party does not rebut this heavy presumption.⁷⁹

(3) Bankruptcy

i. Bills of costs filed against a debtor in bankruptcy

Judicial proceedings relating to a claim against a debtor who has filed for bankruptcy are void ***ab initio*** absent relief from the automatic stay.⁸⁰ As a result of the automatic stay, all formal and informal actions taken against a debtor in bankruptcy are stayed.⁸¹ Accordingly, costs may not be taxed against a debtor in bankruptcy because of the automatic stay provision of the Bankruptcy Code.⁸²

ii. Bills of costs filed by, or on behalf of, a debtor in bankruptcy

“Within one action, claims ***against a debtor*** will be suspended by the automatic stay, even though closely related claims asserted ***by the debtor*** may continue.”⁸³ Accordingly, a debtor in bankruptcy, or the debtor’s estate in bankruptcy, may have 28 U.S.C. § 1920 costs taxed in his, or her or its favor.

(4) Alleged Chilling Effect

According to a 2010 decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, the objection that awarding costs would have a “chilling effect” on litigation which is allegedly socially important is always “***unpersuasive***,”⁸⁴ since “(t)he fact that a prevailing party prosecutes its rights under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to an award of costs ***cannot*** be seen as chilling the flow of litigation.”⁸⁵

To go into further detail, a Clerk’s Taxation of Costs proceeding is not a forum for re-examining the facts of the underlying lawsuit;⁸⁶ therefore, as stated previously, there is a ***heavy presumption***⁸⁷ in favor of “***automatically***”⁸⁸ taxing those types of costs which are listed in 28 U.S.C. § 1920⁸⁹ which the prevailing party both ***actually incurred*** (as evidenced by a sworn affidavit)⁹⁰ and ***necessarily incurred*** (“necessarily” meaning that the costs were reasonably incurred for the prevailing party’s effective preparation, judged in light of the situation existing when the costs in question were actually incurred, without regard to whether the costs relate to items which were actually used).⁹¹

(5) Alleged Good Faith by Non-Prevailing Party

According to a 2010 decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, the alleged good faith of the non-prevailing party is an objection that the Clerk and/or the Court “**may not consider.**”⁹²

To go into further detail, the bare allegation that an action was brought in good faith and was neither frivolous, unreasonable nor without foundation is not sufficient to overcome the presumption inherent in Fed. R. Civ. P. 54 (d) that “costs . . . **should** be allowed to the prevailing party (emphasis added).”⁹³ As the court explained in Popeil Brothers v. Schick Electric, 516 F.2d 772 (7th Cir. 1975), “(i)f the awarding of costs could be thwarted every time the unsuccessful party is a normal, average party and not a knave, Rule 54(d) would have little substance remaining.” 516 F.2d at 776. Hence, “good faith litigation does not absolve a party from imposition of costs.”⁹⁴ If costs were only taxable in those situations where the losing party acted in bad faith, 28 U.S.C. § 1920 would have very little meaning.⁹⁵ A Clerk’s Taxation of Costs proceeding is simply not a forum for re-examining, or for re-litigating, the underlying facts of the lawsuit.⁹⁶ Therefore, it is not a valid objection that the issues in the underlying case were closely contested and that the final judgment allegedly could have, or allegedly should have, gone in the other direction; the alleged complexity or closeness of the issues litigated is not relevant to the taxing of costs by the Court or Clerk.⁹⁷

There is a **heavy presumption**⁹⁸ in favor of “**automatically**”⁹⁹ taxing those types of costs listed in 28 U.S.C. § 1920¹⁰⁰ which the prevailing party both **actually incurred** (as evidenced by a sworn affidavit)¹⁰¹ and **necessarily incurred** (“necessarily” meaning that the costs were reasonably incurred for the prevailing party’s effective preparation, judged in light of the situation existing when the costs in question were actually incurred, without regard to whether the costs relate to items which were actually used).¹⁰²

(6) The Issues in the Underlying Case were Allegedly Close

The general objection that the facts and/or issues in this case were closely contested and allegedly could have, or should have, gone in the other direction and resulted in a victory for the non-prevailing party is an objection that this clerk and/or this court “**may not consider.**”¹⁰³

A Clerk’s Taxation of Costs proceeding is simply not a forum for re-examining, or for re-litigating, the underlying facts of the lawsuit.¹⁰⁴ Therefore, it is not a valid objection that the issues in the underlying case were closely contested and that the final judgment allegedly could have, or allegedly should have, gone in the other direction; the complexity or closeness of the issues litigated is not relevant to the taxing of costs by the Court or Clerk.¹⁰⁵

There is a ***heavy presumption***¹⁰⁶ in favor of “***automatically***”¹⁰⁷ taxing those types of costs which are listed in 28 U.S.C. § 1920¹⁰⁸ which the prevailing party both ***actually incurred*** (as evidenced by a sworn affidavit)¹⁰⁹ and ***necessarily incurred*** (“necessarily” meaning that the costs were reasonably incurred for the prevailing party’s effective preparation, judged in light of the situation existing when the costs in question were actually incurred, without regard to whether the costs relate to items which were actually used).¹¹⁰

(7) *Allegedly Untimely Filing of the Bill of Costs*

The Eastern District of Pennsylvania is one of very few districts in the federal system that has no local rule governing the time for filing a bill of costs. In the absence of any local rule, courts have held that bills of cost must be filed within a “reasonable” time after the conclusion of the litigation.¹¹¹ It is generally advisable for the prevailing party to not file a bill of costs until after any appeals are decided, or until after any period for filing appeals expires, so that if any additional costs are incurred, that bill of costs will not have to be amended.¹¹²

To avoid the possibility of the Clerk entering a taxation opinion which may possibly have to be vacated at a later point in time, the Clerk will delay the taxing of costs until after all appeals have been exhausted¹¹³ (or, until after the time period for filing an appeal has lapsed).¹¹⁴

(8) *Alleged Misconduct*

A. *Alleged Misconduct by the Prevailing Party*

Often a general objection to the bill of costs in its entirety is made, which alleges that costs were allegedly incurred as a result of bad faith on the part of the prevailing party and/or their counsel during the underlying litigation.

A request for taxation of 28 U.S.C. § 1920 costs may be disallowed where there has been misconduct by the prevailing party during the litigation process which led to excessive costs; however, there is a strong presumption in taxation situations that the prevailing party *did not* act in bad faith,¹¹⁵ and the heavy burden of proving such bad faith rests with the non-prevailing party.¹¹⁶

For purposes of taxation of district courts costs, allegedly bad conduct must be analyzed in the light of the situation as it appeared to exist at the time the said allegedly bad act was undertaken (and not in the light of the situation as it appears with the benefit of hindsight).¹¹⁷

The Third Circuit has stated a lawyer’s act of making an argument which could be construed as “well-intentioned zeal” on their client’s behalf cannot be construed as evidence of such bad faith,¹¹⁸ even where the prevailing party did not win regarding every argument made in the underlying litigation.¹¹⁹ The fact that the prevailing party may have incurred some costs relating to a line of argument in the underlying litigation that was ultimately unsuccessful is irrelevant in a taxation matter,¹²⁰ as is the relative degree of complexity of the various issues in the underlying litigation.¹²¹

The determination of whether such misconduct has occurred must be made by the presiding judicial officer, as the Clerk has no fact-finding procedure, and as a Clerk’s Taxation of Costs proceeding is not a forum for re-examining the underlying facts of the lawsuit or for re-litigating the underlying lawsuit.¹²² Therefore, the Clerk may not consider this general objection; if there is an appeal of the taxation opinion by any party, the court may consider this argument pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(1).

B. Alleged Misconduct by the Non-prevailing Party

The prevailing party may allege that the non-prevailing parties acted in bad faith during the litigation process. We note that it is considered to be punitive towards a prevailing party to deny to that prevailing party district court costs which are ordinarily automatically¹²³ taxed under 28 U.S.C. § 1920,¹²⁴ and it is not necessary for the prevailing party to argue that the non-prevailing party did something that was wrong or inappropriate;¹²⁵ however, although it is not necessary, a finding of bad faith on the part of the non-prevailing party would be grounds for ***not*** reducing costs and/or grounds for ***not*** disallowing costs.¹²⁶ This determination must be made by the presiding judicial officer, as the Clerk has no fact-finding procedure, and a Clerk’s Taxation of Costs proceeding is not a forum for re-examining the underlying facts of the lawsuit or for re-litigating the underlying lawsuit.¹²⁷ If there is an appeal of the taxation opinion by any party, the court may consider this argument pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(1).

C. Alleged Malice on the Part of the Prevailing Party

Often a non-prevailing party will argue that filing of the bill of costs against it was allegedly motivated by malice on the part of the prevailing party. We note that the prevailing party’s state of mind is irrelevant to the taxing of costs.

(9) Prevailing Party in the Underlying Lawsuit

A general objection to the bill of costs is often made stating that the prevailing party allegedly prevailed on some issues at the trial, even though judgment was entered in favor of his opponent. The relevant rule of court, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(1), directs the taxing of costs in favor of “the prevailing party.” In order to determine the issue of which party, or parties, prevailed, “the court must (first) identify the relief plaintiff sought,”¹²⁸ then, after that, the court must read the text of the final entry of judgment in the underlying lawsuit,¹²⁹ and then, after that, the court must ask itself “whether the plaintiff achieved ‘some of the benefit sought’ by the party bringing the suit.”¹³⁰ Applying this standard, it is clear that although it is not necessary for a plaintiff to receive **all** of the relief sought, the plaintiff must still receive at least **some** of the relief sought in order to be considered a prevailing party.¹³¹ The plaintiff is considered the prevailing party and the defendants are considered the non-prevailing parties in those situations where a favorable judgment is entered for plaintiff on any of the claims plaintiff asserted, even if plaintiff is only successful on a fraction of the claims asserted and even if plaintiff obtains only a fraction of the relief sought.¹³²

Likewise, the law is clear that where a reading of the text of the judgment indicates that plaintiff had not prevailed on any of its claims or obtained any relief, defendant is considered to be the prevailing party.¹³³ This rule applies and a defendant is considered to be the prevailing party, even where the defendant does not prevail on its counterclaims.¹³⁴ The law is also clear that costs incurred by a defendant may be taxed against a plaintiff who ultimately withdraws an action, even where the withdrawal was voluntary.¹³⁵

If a situation is presented to the Clerk in which plaintiff is either wholly or partially successful on its claims, and defendant is also either wholly or partially successful on its counterclaims, the issue of who is the prevailing party must be decided by the court on a case-by-case basis, and not by the Clerk of Court,¹³⁶ since it requires consideration of the unique facts of the underlying lawsuit and since the Clerk of Court has no fact-finding mechanism for re-examining the underlying facts of the lawsuit or for re-litigating the underlying lawsuit.¹³⁷

It is irrelevant to the taxing of costs that the matter was disposed of by means of summary judgment and no trial took place.¹³⁸ It is irrelevant to the taxing of costs that this matter was disposed of by means of a directed verdict.¹³⁹ It is also irrelevant to the taxing of costs that this matter was disposed of by means of a judgment NOV.¹⁴⁰

It also merits comment that the party who has prevailed at the final stage a lawsuit reaches is considered the prevailing party for the entire lawsuit and may recover costs related to all stages of the lawsuit; this includes earlier stages at which the ultimately prevailing party did not prevail.¹⁴¹

(10) Itemization

A general objection to the bill of costs in its entirety is often raised which claims that the costs sought are allegedly not sufficiently explained. Provided that the bill of costs is neat and legible, there is no need for counsel to use the court's official bill of costs form;¹⁴² there is likewise, no requirement for the prevailing party to supply receipts¹⁴³ (even in a situation where receipts or a more detailed itemization would be useful to the court and/or opposing counsel),¹⁴⁴ rather, caselaw holds that the standard is that costs must be sufficiently explained to the extent that opposing counsel can make informed objections and the Clerk of Court can make an informed determination of whether requested costs are allowable.¹⁴⁵

The bill of costs must be accompanied by an affidavit from prevailing party or its counsel stating, under penalty of perjury, that the costs are correct and were actually and necessarily incurred; the existence of such an affidavit in a Clerk's Taxation of Costs proceeding is given very great weight with respect to the aforesaid burden of proof in favor of the taxation of those types of costs listed in the taxation statute.¹⁴⁶

(11) Alleged Failure of the Prevailing Party to Actually Pay Requested Costs

The objection is sometimes raised of whether costs can be taxed for items which the prevailing party has not paid, which the prevailing party admits are overdue, but nevertheless claims are taxable. Research by this Clerk has uncovered no precedential caselaw on this issue, either in this court or in any federal district or circuit court.

28 U.S.C. §1924 establishes the standard that an amount sought in a bill of costs must be "correct" and must have been "necessarily incurred." This manual has already addressed the subject of "correctness." Concerning the subject of whether these costs have been "necessarily incurred," and with no caselaw on this issue, the Clerk of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania sought a solution to this issue in the *Webster's II New Riverside University Dictionary* (1984). This dictionary defines the word "incur" as "to become liable or subject to, especially because of one's own actions." The standard for taxing costs, therefore, is not whether costs have already been paid by the prevailing party; rather, the standard is whether the prevailing party is liable for these costs. The word "incurred" is not synonymous with the words "already paid."

(12) Alleged Actions of the Trial Court and Alleged Interaction with Attorney Fees

Where the court has expressly allowed or disallowed district court costs **pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1920** (that is, district court costs other than attorney fees and attorney costs) in the final order or judgment, the Clerk is bound to comply with that Order;¹⁴⁷ however, an award or disallowance of attorney fees and attorney costs pursuant

to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(2) it totally separate and distinct from an award of statutory costs pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(1);¹⁴⁸ accordingly, if there is a court Order in the underlying case denying “attorney fees and costs,” it does not preclude the taxing of §1920 costs,¹⁴⁹ and Federal Rule 54(d)(1) costs may be assessed even when attorney fees are disallowed.¹⁵⁰ (Parenthetically, statutes mentioning “attorney fees and costs” mean “attorney fees and attorney costs,” and do not relate to §1920 costs).¹⁵¹

(13) *Alleged Failure to Make Use of the Official Bill of Costs Form*

Although there is a standard form provided by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, use of this form is optional; where the official form is not used, district court costs may yet be taxed where the request for costs is neat, legible and understandable.¹⁵²

(14) *Allegedly Joint and Several Liabilities*

In a case where multiple parties on one side of the bar do not prevail, costs against those multiple losing parties are presumptively joint and several, and any losing party or parties who want costs to be taxed against them in any way other than jointly and severally bears the burden of proving that these costs should be so taxed.¹⁵³

(15) *Cases Brought in Federal Court Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1332 (Commonly known as “diversity jurisdiction”)*

Where an action is brought in federal court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1332 and there are both state and federal cost-shifting statutes or rules of court that may possibly apply, the federal statute or rule trumps the state statute or rule, so that the state procedures may be disregarded, and district court costs may be taxed in diversity jurisdiction cases pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1920 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(1).¹⁵⁴

(16) *United States as a Party*

Title 28 U.S.C. §2412 permits taxation against the United States or any agency or official thereof. The Federal Courts Administration Act of 1992¹⁵⁵ provides that the United States may recover filing fees when it prevails in a civil action.

(17) *State Government as a Party*

The Eleventh Amendment to the Constitution does not bar taxation of district court costs against state government, its agencies or officials.¹⁵⁶

(18) Costs in Admiralty Cases

District court clerks may tax 28 U.S.C. §1920 costs in admiralty cases.¹⁵⁷

(19) Interveners

The prevailing practice is that interveners in agency actions are treated like any other prevailing or losing party.¹⁵⁸

(20) Language on costs in Jurisdictional Statute

In any case brought under a specific statute, the clerk's office must check to see if that statute has provisions concerning costs; if there is a statutory provision concerning costs, that statutory rule, and not 28 U.S.C. §1920, applies.¹⁵⁹ Statutes mentioning "attorney fees and costs" mean "attorney fees and attorney costs," and do not relate to §1920 costs.¹⁶⁰

E. Specific Objections to Normally Allowable District Court Costs

The following is a discussion of the manner in which the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania addresses issues regarding specific items of district court costs which are listed in 28 U.S.C. §1920.

(1) 28 U.S.C. §1920(1)

i. Fees of the Clerk.

The relevant statute, 28 U.S.C. §1920(1) directs the taxing of fees of the Clerk.¹⁶¹ Costs related to both fees of a state clerk and costs for removal to federal court are recoverable in federal court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1920(1)¹⁶² (The Federal Courts Administration Act of 1992 provides that when the United States is a plaintiff that prevails in a civil action, it may recover fees of the Clerk).¹⁶³

There is a heavy presumption¹⁶⁴ in favor of "***automatically***"¹⁶⁵ taxing those types of costs listed in 28 U.S.C. §1920¹⁶⁶ which the prevailing party both ***actually incurred*** (as evidenced by a sworn affidavit)¹⁶⁷ and ***necessarily incurred*** ("necessarily" meaning that the costs were reasonably incurred for the prevailing party's effective preparation, judged in light of the situation existing when the costs in question were actually incurred, without regard to whether the costs relate to items which were actually used).¹⁶⁸

ii. Fees of the Marshal.

The relevant statute, 28 U.S.C. §1920(1), directs the taxing of fees of the Marshal, which includes the costs of service or process, including subpoena service.¹⁶⁹ Federal courts interpret this provision of 28 U.S.C. §1920(1) as permitting the taxing of costs for both governmental process servers and private process servers.¹⁷⁰ Federal courts also interpret this provision of 28 U.S.C. §1920(1) as permitting the taxing of costs for a process server's mileage in connection with that service.¹⁷¹ It is relevant to the taxing of costs whether the non-prevailing party offered to waive service, or whether the prevailing party did or did not request a waiver of service pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4.¹⁷² Costs related to the production of exact copies of an original copy of documentary evidence, including the costs of a subpoena duces tecum (also known as a records subpoena or a records deposition)¹⁷³ are seen as taxable costs pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1920(4), and will be discussed later in this taxation opinion.

There is a heavy presumption¹⁷⁴ in favor of "***automatically***"¹⁷⁵ taxing those types of costs listed in 28 U.S.C. §1920¹⁷⁶ which the prevailing party both ***actually incurred*** (as evidenced by a sworn affidavit)¹⁷⁷ and ***necessarily incurred*** ("necessarily" meaning that the costs were reasonably incurred for the prevailing party's effective preparation, judged in light of the situation existing when the costs in question were actually incurred, without regard to whether the costs relate to items which were actually used).¹⁷⁸

(2) 28 U.S.C. §1920(2)

i. Deposition Costs.

The relevant statute, 28 U.S.C. §1920(2), directs the taxing of costs for "transcripts necessarily obtained for use in the case." This provision governing "transcripts" applies to deposition transcripts;¹⁷⁹ and modern caselaw states that both stenographic depositions and videotaped depositions are considered "transcripts" for purposes of 28 U.S.C. §1920(2);¹⁸⁰ by this standard, a prevailing party may also recover costs associated with the playback of videotaped depositions.¹⁸¹

The Clerk also notes that deposition costs are taxable for the depositions of both fact witnesses and expert witnesses.¹⁸²

There is a heavy presumption¹⁸³ in favor of “***automatically***”¹⁸⁴ taxing those types of costs listed in 28 U.S.C. §1920¹⁸⁵ which the prevailing party both ***actually incurred*** (as evidenced by a sworn affidavit)¹⁸⁶ and ***necessarily incurred*** (“necessarily” meaning that the costs were reasonably incurred for the prevailing party’s effective preparation, judged in light of the situation existing when the costs in question were actually incurred, without regard to whether the costs relate to items which were actually used).¹⁸⁷ Examples of situations where deposition transcripts are seen as necessary for a party’s effective preparation, even where they were not used, ***include, but are not limited to***, situations involving deponents who ultimately do not testify at a trial;¹⁸⁸ situations involving deponents who ultimately are not permitted by the court to testify at a trial;¹⁸⁹ and situations where deposition transcripts were necessary to support, or to oppose, pre-trial motions¹⁹⁰ and/or post-trial motions¹⁹¹ (including motions seeking the entry of summary judgment,¹⁹² and/or motions seeking the entry of a default judgment¹⁹³ and/or motions seeking the entry of a judgment NOV¹⁹⁴). ***Both*** stenographic copies of deposition transcripts ***and*** videotaped copies of transcripts of the exact same testimony are taxable¹⁹⁵ where both copies were necessary to counsel’s effective preparation (judged in light of the situation existing when the costs in question were actually incurred, without regard to whether the costs related to items which were actually used).¹⁹⁶

However, even if a deposition transcript is “necessarily obtained,” counsel may not always recover costs incurred in having it prepared on an expedited basis. Expedited rates for deposition transcripts have been allowed where circumstances justify such a schedule, judged in light of the situation existing at the time of the taking of the testimony in question.¹⁹⁷

ii. Costs of Other Types of Transcripts.

The relevant statute, 28 U.S.C. §1920(2), directs the taxing of costs for “transcripts necessarily obtained for use in the case.” This provision governing “transcripts” applies to trial transcripts and allows for their taxation.¹⁹⁸ This provision governing “transcripts” also applies to transcripts of hearings and other pre-trial proceedings, and allows for their taxation.¹⁹⁹ This provision governing “transcripts” also applies to transcripts of extra-judicial, non-judicial, or other out-of-court proceedings or conferences, and allows for their taxation.²⁰⁰

There is a heavy presumption²⁰¹ in favor of “automatically”²⁰² taxing those types of costs listed in 28 U.S.C. §1920²⁰³ which the prevailing party both ***actually incurred*** (as evidenced by a sworn affidavit)²⁰⁴ and ***necessarily incurred*** (“necessarily” meaning that the costs were reasonably incurred for the prevailing party’s effective preparation, judged in light of the situation existing when the costs in question were actually incurred, without regard to whether the costs relate to items which were actually used).²⁰⁵ Examples of situations where transcripts are seen as necessarily obtained, even where they were not used, ***include, but are not limited to***, situations where the transcripts were needed to support, or to oppose, pre-trial motions²⁰⁶ and/or post-trial motions.²⁰⁷

However, even if such a transcript is “necessarily obtained,” counsel may not always recover costs incurred in having it prepared on an expedited basis. Expedited rates have been allowed where circumstances justify such a schedule, judged in light of the situation existing at the time of the taking of the testimony in question.²⁰⁸

(3) 28 U.S.C. §1920(3).

i. Printing Costs.

The relevant statute, 28 U.S.C. §1920(3), directs the taxing of “printing” costs²⁰⁹ (although typing costs are not taxable under this statute).²¹⁰

There is a heavy presumption²¹¹ in favor of “***automatically***”²¹² taxing those types of costs listed in 28 U.S.C. §1920²¹³ which the prevailing party both ***actually incurred*** (as evidenced by a sworn affidavit)²¹⁴ and ***necessarily incurred*** (“necessarily” meaning that the costs were reasonably incurred for the prevailing party’s effective preparation, judged in light of the situation existing when the costs in question were actually incurred, without regard to whether the costs relate to items which were actually used).²¹⁵

ii. Witness Attendance Fees.

The relevant statute, 28 U.S.C. §1920(3), directs the taxing of witness fees. Witness fees are capped by the witness fee statute, 28 U.S.C. §1821.²¹⁶ The United States Supreme Court has held that the witness fee statute (28 U.S.C. §1821 or its direct predecessor statute) is incorporated by reference into 28 U.S.C. §1920(3) (or its direct predecessor statute).²¹⁷

28 U.S.C. §1821(b) limits witness attendance fees to \$40.00 per witness per day. Witness attendance fees actually incurred by the prevailing party or parties are taxable for every day a witness is either present in court, or present at a deposition hearing,²¹⁸ with a reasonable “good faith” expectation on the part of the prevailing party’s counsel that the witness may have to testify, even where the witness does not actually testify.²¹⁹ (Authority also permits the taxing of attendance costs pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1821(b) for “travel days,” where reasonable.)²²⁰

This limit of \$40.00 per witness per day of attendance applies to both fact and expert witnesses,²²¹ except where the expert witness in question was court-appointed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1920(6).²²² Costs related to an expert’s preparation, or to the creation of an expert report, are not set forth in 28 U.S.C. §1920, and are therefore not taxable.²²³

In addition, although no witness fees are taxable for witnesses who are parties to the litigation,²²⁴ witness fees are taxable for employees of a corporate party as long as they are not real parties in interest to the litigation.²²⁵

There is a heavy presumption²²⁶ in favor of “***automatically***”²²⁷ taxing those types of costs listed in 28 U.S.C. §1920²²⁸ which the prevailing party both ***actually incurred*** (as evidenced by a sworn affidavit)²²⁹ and ***necessarily incurred*** (“necessarily” meaning that the costs were reasonably incurred for the prevailing party’s effective preparation, judged in light of the situation existing when the costs in question were actually incurred, without regard to whether the costs relate to items which were actually used).²³⁰

iii. Witness Travel Costs Fees.

The relevant statute, 28 U.S.C. §1920(3), directs the taxing of witness fees. Witness fees are capped by the witness fee statute, 28 U.S.C. §1821.²³¹ The United States Supreme Court has held that the witness fee statute (28 U.S.C. §1821 or its direct predecessor statute) is incorporated by reference into 28 U.S.C. §1920(3) (or its direct predecessor statute).²³²

28 U.S.C. §1821(c) sets limits, based on reasonableness, on witness travel and mileage costs.

Travel costs are taxable pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1920(3) where the need to travel was reasonable, judged in light of the situation existing at the time the travel costs were incurred.²³³ (Although travel costs for a witness are, at least arguably, taxable pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1920, we hasten to point out that travel costs for an attorney are not taxable pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1920).²³⁴

There is a heavy presumption²³⁵ in favor of ***automatically***²³⁶ taxing those types of costs listed in 28 U.S.C. §1920²³⁷ which the prevailing party both ***actually incurred*** (as evidenced by a sworn affidavit)²³⁸ and ***necessarily incurred*** (“necessarily” meaning that the costs were reasonably incurred for the prevailing party’s effective preparation, judged in light of the situation existing when the costs in question were actually incurred, without regard to whether the costs relate to items which were actually used).²³⁹

iv. Witness Subsistence Fee.

The relevant statute, 28 U.S.C. §1920(3), directs the taxing of witness fees. Witness fees are capped by the witness fee statute, 28 U.S.C. §1821.²⁴⁰ The United States Supreme Court has held that the witness fee statute (28 U.S.C. §1821 or its direct predecessor statute) is incorporated by reference into 28 U.S.C. §1920(3) (or its direct predecessor statute).²⁴¹

28 U.S.C. §1821(d) limits witness subsistence (meals and lodging) allowances in “high cost” areas such as the Eastern District of Pennsylvania to \$328.50 per day when the traveling witness can supply ***all*** of his or her receipts for their requested subsistence allowance (and \$219.00 per day when the witness cannot supply ***all*** of his or her receipts for their requested subsistence allowance); the witness can also recover a flat rate of \$49.50 in subsistence for the last day of their trip.

Witness subsistence fees are taxable pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1920(3) where the need to travel was reasonable, judged in light of the situation existing at the time the costs were incurred.²⁴² (Although subsistence fees for a witness are, at least arguably, taxable pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1920, we hasten to point out that subsistence fees for an attorney are not taxable pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1920).²⁴³

There is a heavy presumption²⁴⁴ in favor of ***automatically***²⁴⁵ taxing those types of costs listed in 28 U.S.C. §1920²⁴⁶ which the prevailing party both ***actually incurred*** (as evidenced by a sworn affidavit)²⁴⁷ and ***necessarily incurred*** (“necessarily” meaning that the costs were reasonably incurred for the prevailing party’s effective preparation, judged in light of the situation existing when the costs in question were actually incurred, without regard to whether the costs relate to items which were actually used).²⁴⁸

(4) 28 U.S.C. §1920(4).

i. Documentary Evidence.

The relevant statute, 28 U.S.C. §1920(4), directs the taxing of “fees for exemplification and the cost of making copies of any materials where the copies are necessarily obtained for use in the case(.)” The United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit spoke on 28 U.S.C. §1920(4) in Race Tires America, Inc. v. Hoosier Racing Tire Corp., 674 F.3d 158 (3d Cir. 2012).

Citing Webster’s Third International Dictionary 504 (3d edition 1993) as authority, the Race Tires America court noted that the word “copy” means “***an imitation, transcript or reproduction of an original work.***”

The Race Tires America court applied this dictionary definition to conclude that for purposes of 28 U.S.C. §1920(4), ***the word “copying” means the “scanning,” “conversion” or “reproduction” of an “original” item of “evidence” so as to create a “duplicate” copy of that “evidence.”*** The Race Tires America court also applied this dictionary definition to conclude that ***the word “copying” also means the “scanning,” “conversion” or “reproduction” of an “original” “transcript,” so as to create a “duplicate” copy of that “transcript.”***

Accordingly, a duplicate copy of original records,²⁴⁹ or a duplicate copy of other original documents produced in discovery,²⁵⁰ as well as the costs of a subpoena duces tecum (also known as a records subpoena or a records deposition)²⁵¹ are taxable costs pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1920(4).²⁵²

There is a heavy presumption²⁵³ in favor of ***automatically***²⁵⁴ taxing those types of costs listed in 28 U.S.C. §1920²⁵⁵ which the prevailing party both ***actually incurred*** (as evidenced by a sworn affidavit)²⁵⁶ and ***necessarily incurred*** (“necessarily” meaning that the costs were reasonably incurred for the prevailing party’s effective preparation, judged in light of the situation existing when the costs in question were actually incurred, without regard to whether the costs relate to items which were actually used).²⁵⁷

Situations where costs of exact duplicate copies of original evidence are seen as “necessary” pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1920(4) (even where the duplicate copies in question were not used) ***include, but are not limited to***, situations where such exact duplicate copies of original evidence are attached to any deposition transcript,²⁵⁸ and/or situations where such exact duplicate copies of original evidence are attached to any pleading²⁵⁹ and/or situations where such exact duplicate copies of original evidence are attached to any motion²⁶⁰ (including a motion for summary judgment).²⁶¹

ii. Demonstrative Evidence.

The relevant statute, 28 U.S.C. §1920(4), directs the taxing of “fees for exemplification and the cost of making copies of any materials where the copies are necessarily obtained for use in the case(.)” The United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit spoke on 28 U.S.C. §1920(4) in Race Tires America, Inc. v. Hoosier Racing Tire Corp., 674 F.3d 158 (3d Cir. 2012). The Race Tires America court held that the word “copies” means an exact copy, or an exact duplicate, of an original piece of evidence. The Race Tires America court also found that because, in drafting 28 U.S.C. §1920(4), Congress had specifically used two different words in the same statute (“copies” and “exemplification”), that that word “copies” and the word “exemplification” presumptively do not have the same meaning (although the Race Tires America court pointedly declined to offer a definition of the word “exemplification”).

With no guidance from the Third Circuit in Race Tires America, the only ***controlling*** guidance in ***this*** jurisdiction regarding a definition of the word “exemplification” for purposes of 28 U.S.C. §1920(4) is found in In re: Kulicke and Sofa Industries Securities Litigation, 747 F. Supp. 1136 (E.D. Pa. 1990); aff’d without comment, 944 F.2d 897 (3rd Cir. 1991), which held that the concept of “exemplification” incorporates the concept “demonstrative evidence.” Federal courts in other jurisdictions have reached the same conclusion.²⁶² Examples of such taxable costs relating to demonstrative evidence include the costs of

photos,²⁶³ models,²⁶⁴ maps,²⁶⁵ blow-ups,²⁶⁶ charts,²⁶⁷ diagrams,²⁶⁸ computer graphics,²⁶⁹ and the like; however, costs related to an expert's preparation or to the creation of an expert report are a prohibited item which cannot be allowed as exemplification).²⁷⁰

There is a heavy presumption²⁷¹ in favor of "***automatically***"²⁷² taxing those types of costs listed in 28 U.S.C. §1920²⁷³ which the prevailing party both ***actually incurred*** (as evidenced by a sworn affidavit)²⁷⁴ and ***necessarily incurred*** ("necessarily" meaning that the costs were reasonably incurred for the prevailing party's effective preparation, judged in light of the situation existing when the costs in question were actually incurred, without regard to whether the costs relate to items which were actually used).²⁷⁵ Examples of situations where such costs are seen as necessary pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1920(4), even where the demonstrative evidence in question was not used, ***include, but are not limited to***, situations where such demonstrative evidence is attached to any deposition transcript,²⁷⁶ and/or situations where such demonstrative evidence is attached to any pleading²⁷⁷ and/or situations where such demonstrative evidence is attached to any motion²⁷⁸ (including a motion for summary judgment).²⁷⁹

(5) 28 U.S.C. §1920(5).

i. Docket Fees.

The relevant statute, 28 U.S.C. §1920(5), directs the taxing of those types of docket fees authorized by under 28 U.S.C. §1923.²⁸⁰

There is a heavy presumption²⁸¹ in favor of "***automatically***"²⁸² taxing those types of costs listed in 28 U.S.C. §1920²⁸³ which the prevailing party both ***actually incurred*** (as evidenced by a sworn affidavit)²⁸⁴ and ***necessarily incurred*** ("necessarily" meaning that the costs were reasonably incurred for the prevailing party's effective preparation, judged in light of the situation existing when the costs in question were actually incurred, without regard to whether the costs relate to items which were actually used).²⁸⁵

(6) 28 U.S.C. §1920(6).

i. Court Appointed Experts.

The relevant statute, 28 U.S.C. §1920(6), directs the taxing of costs of "court appointed experts." Costs related to the preparation of an expert's testimony or report are not mentioned in 28 U.S.C. §1920 and are therefore not taxable²⁸⁶ (although we note that costs incurred for

an expert's preparation of an exhibit may be taxable in a situation where the prevailing party can demonstrate that these costs are strictly limited to exhibit preparation and do not involve preparation of testimony or a report.)²⁸⁷ Such unallowable costs also include costs related to an Independent Medical Examination.²⁸⁸

There is a heavy presumption²⁸⁹ in favor of *automatically*²⁹⁰ taxing those types of costs listed in 28 U.S.C. §1920²⁹¹ which the prevailing party both *actually incurred* (as evidenced by a sworn affidavit)²⁹² and *necessarily incurred* (“necessarily” meaning that the costs were reasonably incurred for the prevailing party’s effective preparation, judged in light of the situation existing when the costs in question were actually incurred, without regard to whether the costs relate to items which were actually used).²⁹³

ii. Interpreters.

The relevant statute, 28 U.S.C. §1920(6), authorizes “(the) compensation of interpreters.” These costs are limited to the cost of oral translation, and do not include the cost of document translation (based on the ordinary definition of the word “interpreters”).²⁹⁴

In addition, the fees and the salaries, expenses, and costs of special interpretation services under 28 U.S.C. §1818 are recoverable pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1920(6).

There is a heavy presumption²⁹⁵ in favor of *automatically*²⁹⁶ taxing those types of costs listed in 28 U.S.C. §1920²⁹⁷ which the prevailing party both *actually incurred* (as evidenced by a sworn affidavit)²⁹⁸ and *necessarily incurred* (“necessarily” meaning that the costs were reasonably incurred for the prevailing party’s effective preparation, judged in light of the situation existing when the costs in question were actually incurred, without regard to whether the costs relate to items which were actually used).²⁹⁹

F. Special Procedures for Allowance of District Court Costs in Situations Involving Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 68

As previously stated, it is well-established that costs may not be imposed in federal district courts except where they are authorized by either a statute or a rule of court.³⁰⁰

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 68 provides that:

“(A) party defending against a claim may serve on an opposing party an offer to allow judgment on specified terms, with the costs then accrued . . . (if this offer is not accepted, and the subsequent) judgment that the offeree finally obtains is not more favorable than the unaccepted offer, the offeree must pay the costs incurred after the offer was made.”

The policy supporting Rule 68 is the societal interest in encouraging settlement of cases, thereby saving the litigants and the court from unnecessary costs and effort.³⁰¹

Rule 68 costs are taxable only by a district court judge, not the Clerk of the District Court.

Rule 68 costs may include attorney fees where the substantive statute at the heart of the case defines “costs” as including attorney fees; however, where the substantive statute at the heart of the case does not define “costs” as including attorney fees, then attorney fees are customarily not taxable pursuant to Rule 68.³⁰² According to this rule, where the offer does not specifically mention attorney fees as part of costs, such an offer does not necessarily exclude an allowance of attorney fees: the key factor is the language of the substantive statute at the heart of the case.³⁰³

Rule 68 does not apply in situations where a defendant serves upon the adverse party an offer to allow judgment to be taken against the defendant, and the final judgment is entered **in favor of the defendant, not the plaintiff.**³⁰⁴

G. Taxation of Appellate Court Costs and Supreme Court Costs by the Clerk of the District Court

It is well-established that costs may not be imposed by the clerk of the district court except where they are authorized by either a statute or a rule of court.³⁰⁵ As previously stated, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(1) expressly makes those items of district court costs which are listed in 28 U.S.C. §1920³⁰⁶ taxable by the clerk of the district court.³⁰⁷ In addition, Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 39(e) “expressly”³⁰⁸ makes certain items of appellate court costs which are listed in that rule taxable by the clerk of the district court.³⁰⁹ Those items of appellate court costs made taxable by the district court clerk by Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 39(e) are:

- (1) the preparation and transmission of the record;
- (2) the reporter’s transcript, if needed to determine the appeal:

- (3) premiums paid for a supersedeas bond, or other bond to preserve rights pending appeal; and
- (4) the fee for filing the notice of appeal.

We note that those types of costs listed in F.R.A.P. 39(e) are plainly not the same types of costs listed in the taxation statute, 28 U.S.C. §1920;³¹⁰ however, we also note that F.R.A.P. 39(e) “***expressly***”³¹¹ states that the types of costs listed in that appellate rule of court are taxable by the clerk of the district court.³¹² In resolving this apparent conflict, it must be noted that since the adoption of the procedures created by F.R.A.P. 39(e) postdates the adoption of the procedures created by 28 U.S.C. §1920, that to the extent that there is any apparent conflict, the district court clerk must give F.R.A.P. 39(e) more weight than 28 U.S.C. §1920 when taxing appellate court costs.³¹³ ***Accordingly, appellate court costs which are listed in F.R.A.P. 39(e) are taxable by the clerk of the district court, regardless of whether §1920 authorizes an award of those (appellate court) costs.***³¹⁴ The rationale behind this procedure directing the district court clerk, rather than the appellate court clerk, to tax appellate court costs pursuant to F.R.A.P. 39(e) is “general convenience.”³¹⁵

Once the appellate court has entered a final judgment in the underlying litigation, the clerk of the district court may tax these F.R.A.P. 39(e) costs without the need to wait for an instruction from the appellate court or from the appellate clerk directing the district clerk to tax them³¹⁶ (except where there is dispute between the parties pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 39(a)(4) as to who exactly is the prevailing party in the appellate court).³¹⁷ In addition, the district clerk has the discretion to tax costs even where the appellate court orders that both sides shall bear their own costs.³¹⁸

In addition to these procedures, it bears noting that one of the most firmly established constitutional principles is the mandate principle, which hold that when a higher court issues a mandate, lower courts must obey it with regard to all issues which that higher court addressed.³¹⁹ In addition, mandate costs imposed by an appellate court leave no discretion in the hands of the district court or its Clerk; the Clerk of the district court ***must*** tax costs as shown on mandate of a United States Court of Appeals³²⁰ (the rationale behind this procedure is that a federal district court is the only federal court with the authority to actually execute on a judgment).³²¹

This document will now address the request for costs incurred before the United States Supreme Court.

It is well-established that costs may not be imposed in federal district courts except where they are authorized by either a statute or a rule of court.³²² Costs taxable by the United States Supreme Court are limited pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 43.3 to fees of the Clerk of the United States Supreme Court and costs of printing the joint appendix; the Clerk of the United States Supreme Court shall include these costs in the mandate; when a higher court issues a mandate; lower courts must obey it with regard to all issues which that higher court addressed.³²³ Accordingly, the Clerk of the district court ***must*** tax costs as shown on mandate of the United States Supreme Court³²⁴ (the rationale behind this procedure is that a federal district court is the only federal court with the authority to actually execute on a judgment).³²⁵

ENDNOTES:

1. Taniguchi v. Kan Pacific Saipan, Ltd., 132 S.Ct. 1997 (2012); Alyeska Pipeline Service Co. v. Wilderness Society, 421 U.S. 240 (1975); Fleischmann Distilling Co. v. Maier Brewing Co., 386 U.S. 714 (1967); Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995).
2. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995).
3. Taniguchi v. Kan Pacific Saipan, Ltd., 132 S.Ct. 1997 (2012); Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Alyeska Pipeline Service Co. v. Wilderness Society, 421 U.S. 240 (1975); Fleischmann Distilling Co. v. Maier Brewing Co., 386 U.S. 714 (1967); Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Adams v. Teamsters Local 115, 678 F.Supp.2d 314 (E.D. Pa. 2007).
4. Taniguchi v. Kan Pacific Saipan, Ltd., 132 S.Ct. 1997 (2012); Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); McKenna v. City of Philadelphia, 582 F.3d 447 (3d Cir. 2009).
5. Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Lacovara v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, 102 F.R.D. 959 (E.D. Pa. 1984).
6. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Adams v. Teamsters Local 115, 678 F.Supp.2d 314 (E.D. Pa. 2007); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998).
7. Brazos Valley Coalition for Life, Inc. v. City of Bryan, Texas, 421 F.3d 314 (5th Cir. 2005); Trepel v. Roadway Express, Inc., 266 F.3d 418 (6th Cir. 2001); Holmes v. Cessna Aircraft Co., 11 F.3d 63 (5th Cir. 1994); Dovenmuehle v. Gildorn Mortgage Midwest Corp., 871 F.2d 697 (7th Cir. 1989); Mason v. Belieu, 543 F.2d 215 (D.C. Cir. 1976); Wahl v. Carrier Manufacturing Co., 511 F.2d 209 (7th Cir. 1975); McInnis v. Town of Weston, 458 F.Supp.2d 7 (D. Conn. 2006); Sullivan v. Cheshier, 991 F.Supp. 999 (N.D. Ill. 1998); Hollenbeck v. Falstaff Brewing Corp., 605 F.Supp. 421 (E.D. Mo. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 980 (E.D. Mo. 1983).
8. Crawford Fitting Company v. J. T. Gibbons, Inc., 482 U.S. 437 (1987); Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Nugget Distributors Cooperative of America v. Mr. Nugget, Inc., 145 F.R.D. 54 (E.D. Pa. 1992). Accord, Perry v. Metro Suburban Bus Authority; 236 FRD 110 (EDNY 2006); Schmitz-Werke GMBH v. Rockland Industries, 271 F.Supp. 2d 734 (D. Maryland 2003); Roberts v. Interstate Distrib. Co., 242 F.Supp. 2d 850 (D. Oregon 2002); In Re: Glacier Bay, 746 F.Supp. 1379 (D. Alaska 1990).

9. Brazos Valley Coalition for Life, Inc. v. City of Bryan, Texas, 421 F.3d 314 (5th Cir. 2005); Trepel v. Roadway Express, Inc., 266 F.3d 418 (6th Cir. 2001); Holmes v. Cessna Aircraft Co., 11 F.3d 63 (5th Cir. 1994); Dovenmuehle v. Gildorn Mortgage Midwest Corp., 871 F.2d 697 (7th Cir. 1989); Mason v. Belieu, 543 F.2d 215 (D.C. Cir. 1976); Wahl v. Carrier Manufacturing Co., 511 F.2d 209 (7th Cir. 1975); McInnis v. Town of Weston, 458 F.Supp.2d 7 (D. Conn. 2006); Sullivan v. Cheshier, 991 F.Supp. 999 (N.D. Ill. 1998); Hollenbeck v. Falstaff Brewing Corp., 605 F.Supp. 421 (E.D. Mo. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 980 (E.D. Mo. 1983).
10. Brown v. American Enka Corp., 452 F.Supp. 154 (ED Tenn. 1976).
11. Brown v. American Enka Corp., 452 F.Supp. 154 (ED Tenn. 1976).
12. In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3rd Cir. 2000). Accord, Soberay Mach. & Equip. Co. v. MRF Ltd., 181 F.3d 759 (6th Cir. 1999); Lorenz v. Valley Forge Insurance Co., 23 F.3d 1259 (7th Cir. 1994); McGuigan v. Cae Link Corp., 155 FRD 31 (NDNY 1994); American Key Corp. v. Cumberland Associates, 102 FRD 496 (NDGa 1984); and Dorothy K. Winston & Co. v. Town Heights Dev., Inc., 68 FRD 431 (DDC 1975).
13. Northbrook Excess and Surplus Insurance Co. v. Procter & Gamble Co., 924 F.2d 633 (7th Cir. 1991).
14. Alyeska Pipeline Service Co. v. Wilderness Society, 421 U.S. 240 (1975); Adams v. Teamsters Local 115, 678 F.Supp.2d 314 (E.D. Pa. 2007); Nugget Distributors Cooperative of America v. Mr. Nugget, Inc., 145 F.R.D. 54 (E.D.Pa. 1992). Accord, Cook Children's Medical Center v. New England PPO Plan of Gen. Consol. Management, 491 F.3d 266 (5th Cir. 2007); Perry v. Metro Suburban Bus Authority; 236 F.R.D. 110 (EDNY 2006); Schmitz-Werke GMBH v. Rockland Industries, 271 F.Supp. 2d 734 (D. Maryland 2003); Roberts v. Interstate Distrib. Co., 242 F.Supp. 2d 850 (D. Oregon 2002); US v. Bedford Associates, 548 F.Supp. 748 (SDNY 1982).
15. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Adams v. Teamsters Local 115, 678 F.Supp.2d 314 (E.D. Pa. 2007).
16. Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3rd Cir. 1985); Pearlstine v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D.Pa. 1998). Accord, In Re: Air Crash Disaster at John F. Kennedy International Airport on June 24, 1975, 687 F.2d 626 (2nd Cir. 1982); In Re: Glacier Bay, 746 F.Supp. 1379 (D. Alaska 1990).
17. Chambers v. NASCO, Inc., 501 U.S. 32 (1991); Alyeska Pipeline Service Co. v. Wilderness Society, 421 U.S. 240 (1975); Fleischmann Distilling Co. v. Maier Brewing Co., 386 U.S. 714 (1967).
18. Nugget Distributors Cooperative of America v. Mr. Nugget, Inc., 145 F.R.D. 54 (E.D.Pa. 1992). Accord, Alyeska Pipeline Service Co. v. Wilderness Society, 421 U.S. 240 (1975); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995). See also, Harkins v. Riverboat Services, 286 F. Supp. 2d 976 (ND Ill. 2003), aff'd, 385 F.3d 1099 (7th Cir. 2004); and In Re: Glacier Bay, 746 F.Supp. 1379 (D. Alaska 1990).
19. Race Tires America, Inc. v. Hoosier Racing Tire Corp., 2012 WL 887593 (3d Cir. March 16, 2012).
20. In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Levin v. Parkhouse, 484 F.Supp. 1091 (E.D. Pa. 1980). Accord, In Re: San Juan Dupont Plaza Hotel Fire Litigation, 994 F.2d 956 (1st Cir. 1993); Krouse v. American Sterilizer Co., 928 F.Supp. 543 (W.D. Pa. 1996); In Re: Glacier Bay, 746 F.Supp. 1379 (D. Alaska 1990); Stacy v. Williams, 50 F.R.D. 52 (N.D. Miss. 1970); Bourazak v. North River Insurance Co., 280 F.Supp. 89 (S.D. Ill. 1968).
21. Race Tires America, Inc. v. Hoosier Racing Tire Corp., 2012 WL 887593 (3d Cir. March 16, 2012).

22. Smith v. Tenet Healthsystems SL, Inc., 436 F.3d 879 (8th Cir. 2006); Helms v. WalMart Stores, Inc., 808 F.Supp. 1568 (ND Ga. 1992), aff'd 998 F.2d 1023 (11th Cir. 1993); Soler v. McHenry, 771 F.Supp. 252 (ND Ill. 1991), aff'd, 989 F.2d 251 (7th Cir. 1993); Haagen-Dazs Co. v. Rainbow Gourmet Ice Creams, Inc., 920 F.2d 587 (9th Cir. 1990); Rodriguez-Garcia v. Davila, 904 F.2d 90 (1st Cir. 1990); Allen v. United States Steel Corp., 665 F.2d 689 (5th Cir. 1982); McGuigan v. CAE Link Corp., 155 FRD 31 (NDNY 1994); Nelson v. Darragh Co., 120 FRD 517 (WD Ark. 1988); Radol v. Thomas, 113 FRD 172 (SD Ohio 1986); Roche v. Normandy, 566 F.Supp. 37 (ED Mo. 1983); Meadows v. Ford Motor Co., 62 FRD 98 (WD Ky. 1973); Gillam v. A. Shyman, Inc., 31 FRD 271 (D. Alaska 1962).
23. Smith v. Tenet Healthsystems SL, Inc., 436 F.3d 879 (8th Cir. 2006).
24. Yasui v. Maui Electric Co., 78 F.Supp. 2d 1124 (D. Hawaii 1999); Garonzik v. Whitman Diner, 910 F.Supp 167 (D.N.J. 1995); Corsair Asset Management, Inc. v. Moskovitz, 142 FRD 347 (N.D. Ga. 1992).
25. Montgomery County v. Microvote Corp., 2004 WL 1087196 (EDPA 2004); Sun Media Systems, Inc. v. KDSM, LLC, 587 F.Supp. 2d 1059 (S.D. Iowa 2008).
26. Gary Brown and Associates v. Ashdon, Inc., 268 Fed.Appx. 837 (11th Cir. 2008); Jensen v. Lawler, 338 F.Supp. 2d 739 (SD Texas 2004).
27. Nugget Distributors Cooperative of America v. Mr. Nugget, Inc., 145 F.R.D. 54 (E.D.Pa. 1992). Accord, In Re: San Juan Dupont Plaza Hotel Fire Litigation, 994 F.2d 956 (1st Cir. 1993); United States Football League v. National Football League, 887 F.2d 408 (2nd Cir. 1989); Wahl v. Carrier Manufacturing Co., 511 F.2d 209 (7th Cir. 1975); In Re: Glacier Bay, 746 F.Supp. 1379 (D. Alaska 1990); Hollenbeck v. Falstaff Brewing Corp., 605 F.Supp. 421 (ED Mo. 1984).
28. United States Football League v. National Football League, 887 F.2d 408 (2nd Cir. 1989); Allen v. United States Steel Corp., 665 F.2d 689 (5th Cir. 1982).
29. Nugget Distributors Cooperative of America v. Mr. Nugget, Inc., 145 F.R.D. 54 (E.D.Pa. 1992). Accord, Avirgan v. Hull, 705 F.Supp. 1544 (SD Fla 1989), aff'd, 932 F.2d 1572 (11th Cir. 1991); Wahl v. Carrier Manufacturing Co., 511 F.2d 209 (7th Cir. 1975); Corsair Asset Management, Inc. v. Moskovitz, 142 F.R.D. 347 (ND Ga 1992); In Re: Glacier Bay, 746 F.Supp. 1379 (D. Alaska 1990).
30. Wahl v. Carrier Manufacturing Co., 511 F.2d 209 (7th Cir. 1975); In Re: Glacier Bay, 746 F.Supp. 1379 (D. Alaska 1990).
31. Corsair Asset Management, Inc. v. Moskovitz, 142 F.R.D. 347 (ND Ga 1992); Litton Systems, Inc. V. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 613 F.Supp. 824 (SDNY 1985).
32. Nugget Distributors Cooperative of America v. Mr. Nugget, Inc., 145 F.R.D. 54 (E.D.Pa. 1992). Accord, Gary Brown and Associates v. Ashdon, Inc., 268 Fed.Appx. 837 (11th Cir. 2008); Avirgan v. Hull, 705 F.Supp. 1544 (SD Fla 1989), aff'd, 932 F.2d 1572 (11th Cir. 1991); Wahl v. Carrier Manufacturing Co., 511 F.2d 209 (7th Cir. 1975); Sun Media Systems, Inc. v. KDSM, LLC, 587 F.Supp. 2d 1059 (S.D. Iowa 2008); Yasui v. Maui Electric Co., 78 F.Supp.2d 1124 (D. Hawaii 1999); Royal Palace Hotel Associates v. International Resort Classics, 178 FRD 595 (MD Fl. 1998); Corsair Asset Management, Inc. v. Moskovitz, 142 FRD 347 (ND Ga 1992); In Re: Glacier Bay, 746 F.Supp. 1379 (D. Alaska 1990); Central Delaware Branch of the NAACP v. City of Dover, Delaware, 123 FRD 85 (D. Delaware 1988); Hollenbeck v. Falstaff Brewing Corp., 605 F.Supp. 421 (ED Mo. 1984); Evans v. Fuller, 94 F.R.D. 311, 314 (W.D. Ark. 1982); Neely v. General Electric Co., 90 F.R.D. 627, 630 (N.D. Ga. 1981); United States v. Bexar County, 89 F.R.D. 391, 394 (W.D. Tex. 1981).
33. Sun Media Systems, Inc. v. KDSM, LLC, 587 F.Supp. 2d 1059 (S.D. Iowa 2008).
34. Gary Brown and Associates v. Ashdon, Inc., 268 Fed.Appx. 837 (11th Cir. 2008); Sun Media Systems, Inc. v. KDSM, LLC, 587 F.Supp. 2d 1059 (S.D. Iowa 2008); Central Delaware Branch of the NAACP v. City of Dover, Delaware, 123 F.R.D. 85 (D. Delaware 1988).
35. Sun Media Systems, Inc. v. KDSM, LLC, 587 F.Supp. 2d 1059 (S.D. Iowa 2008); Central Delaware Branch of the NAACP v. City of Dover, Delaware, 123 F.R.D. 85 (D. Delaware 1988).

36. Sun Media Systems, Inc. v. KDSM, LLC, 587 F.Supp. 2d 1059 (S.D. Iowa 2008); Yasui v. Maui Electric Co., 78 F.Supp.2d 1124 (D. Hawaii 1999); Cody v. Private Agencies Collaborating Together, Inc., 911 F.Supp. 1 (D.D.C. 1995).
37. Sun Media Systems, Inc. v. KDSM, LLC, 587 F.Supp. 2d 1059 (S.D. Iowa 2008).
38. Central Delaware Branch of the NAACP v. City of Dover, Delaware, 123 F.R.D. 85 (D. Delaware 1988).
39. Nugget Distributors Cooperative of America v. Mr. Nugget, Inc., 145 F.R.D. 54 (E.D.Pa. 1992); *See, also*, Gary Brown and Associates v. Ashdon, Inc., 268 Fed.Appx. 837 (11th Cir. 2008); Duckworth v. Whisenant, 97 F.3d 1393 (11th Cir. 1993); Avirgan v. Hull, 705 F.Supp. 1544 (SD Fla 1989), *aff'd*, 932 F.2d 1572 (11th Cir. 1991); Sun Media Systems, Inc. v. KDSM, LLC, 587 F.Supp. 2d 1059 (S.D. Iowa 2008); DiBella v. Hopkins, 407 F.Supp.2d 537 (SDNY 2005); Yasui v. Maui Electric Co., 78 F.Supp.2d 1124 (D. Hawaii 1999); Royal Palace Hotel Associates v. International Resort Classics, 178 FRD 595 (MD Fl. 1998); Corsair Asset Management, Inc. v. Moskovitz, 142 FRD 347 (ND Ga 1992); Aloha Towers Associates v. Millenium Aloha, Inc., 938 F. Supp. 646 (D. Hawaii 1996); U.S. v. Bedford Associates, 548 F.Supp. 748, 753 (S.D.N.Y. 1982).
40. Nugget Distributors Cooperative of America v. Mr. Nugget, Inc., 145 F.R.D. 54 (E.D.Pa. 1992). *Accord*, In Re: San Juan Dupont Plaza Hotel Fire Litigation, 994 F.2d 956 (1st Cir. 1993); Wahl v. Carrier Manufacturing Co., 511 F.2d 209 (7th Cir. 1975); Avirgan v. Hull, 705 F.Supp. 1544 (SD Fla 1989), *aff'd*, 932 F.2d 1572 (11th Cir. 1991); Massachusetts Fair Share v. Law Enforcement Assistance Association, 776 F.2d 1066, 1070 (D.C. Cir. 1985); Sun Media Systems, Inc. v. KDSM, LLC, 587 F.Supp. 2d 1059 (S.D. Iowa 2008); Yasui v. Maui Electric Co., 78 F.Supp.2d 1124 (D. Hawaii 1999); Royal Palace Hotel Associates v. International Resort Classics, 178 FRD 595 (MD Fl. 1998); Cody v. Private Agencies Collaborating Together, Inc., 911 F.Supp. 1 (D.D.C. 1995); Corsair Asset Management, Inc. v. Moskovitz, 142 FRD 347 (ND Ga 1992); In Re: Glacier Bay, 746 F.Supp. 1379 (D. Alaska 1990); General Drivers and Dairy Employees, Local 563 v. Bake Rite Baking Co., 580 F.Supp. 426, 440 (E.D. Wisc. 1984); Hollenbeck v. Falstaff Brewing Corp., 605 F.Supp. 421 (ED Mo. 1984).
41. In Re: Glacier Bay, 746 F.Supp. 1379 (D. Alaska 1990); Hollenbeck v. Falstaff Brewing Corp., 605 F.Supp. 421 (ED Mo. 1984).
42. Nugget Distributors Cooperative of America v. Mr. Nugget, Inc., 145 F.R.D. 54 (E.D.Pa. 1992). *Accord*, Avirgan v. Hull, 705 F.Supp. 1544 (SD Fla 1989), *aff'd*, 932 F.2d 1572 (11th Cir. 1991); Sun Media Systems, Inc. v. KDSM, LLC, 587 F.Supp. 2d 1059 (S.D. Iowa 2008); Cody v. Private Agencies Collaborating Together, Inc., 911 F.Supp. 1 (D.D.C. 1995); Corsair Asset Management, Inc. v. Moskovitz, 142 F.R.D. 347 (ND Ga 1992); In re: San Juan DuPont Plaza Hotel Fire Litigation, 142 F.R.D. 41 (D.P.R. 1992); Hollenbeck v. Falstaff Brewing Corp., 605 F.Supp. 421 (ED Mo. 1984).
43. Nugget Distributors Cooperative of America v. Mr. Nugget, Inc., 145 F.R.D. 54 (E.D.Pa. 1992). *Accord*, Gary Brown and Associates v. Ashdon, Inc., 268 Fed.Appx. 837 (11th Cir. 2008); Avirgan v. Hull, 705 F.Supp. 1544 (SD Fla 1989), *aff'd*, 932 F.2d 1572 (11th Cir. 1991); Yasui v. Maui Electric Co., 78 F.Supp.2d 1124 (D. Hawaii 1999); Corsair Asset Management, Inc. v. Moskovitz, 142 FRD 347 (ND Ga 1992); In Re: Glacier Bay, 746 F.Supp. 1379 (D. Alaska 1990); Hollenbeck v. Falstaff Brewing Corp., 605 F.Supp. 421 (ED Mo. 1984).
44. McGuigan v. CAE Link Corp., 155 FRD 31 (NDNY 1994).
45. In the Matter of Penn Central Transportation Co., 630 F.2d 183 (3d Cir. 1980); Nugget Distributors Cooperative of America v. Mr. Nugget, Inc., 145 F.R.D. 54 (E.D.Pa. 1992). *Accord*, Gary Brown and Associates v. Ashdon, Inc., 268 Fed.Appx. 837 (11th Cir. 2008); Duckworth v. Whisenant, 97 F.3d 1393 (11th Cir. 1993); Avirgan v. Hull, 705 F.Supp. 1544 (SD Fla 1989), *aff'd*, 932 F.2d 1572 (11th Cir. 1991); Wahl v. Carrier Manufacturing Co., 511 F.2d 209 (7th Cir. 1975); Zeuner v. Rare Hospitality Int'l, 386 F.Supp. 2d 635 (MDNC 2005); Yasui v. Maui Electric Co., 78 F.Supp.2d 1124 (D. Hawaii 1999); Royal Palace Hotel Associates v. International Resort Classics, 178 FRD 595 (MD Fl. 1998); Cody v. Private Agencies Collaborating Together, Inc., 911 F.Supp. 1 (D.D.C. 1995); Corsair Asset Management, Inc. v. Moskovitz, 142 FRD 347 (ND Ga 1992); In Re: Glacier Bay, 746 F.Supp. 1379 (D. Alaska 1990); Hollenbeck v. Falstaff Brewing Corp., 605 F.Supp. 421 (ED Mo. 1984).
46. Wahl v. Carrier Manufacturing Co., 511 F.2d 209 (7th Cir. 1975); Sun Media Systems, Inc. v. KDSM, LLC, 587 F.Supp. 2d 1059 (S.D. Iowa 2008); In Re: Glacier Bay, 746 F.Supp. 1379 (D. Alaska 1990); Hollenbeck v. Falstaff Brewing Corp., 605 F.Supp. 421 (ED Mo. 1984).

47. Nelson v. Darragh Co., 120 F.R.D. 517 (W.D. Ark. 1988); Mallonee v. Fahey, 117 F.Supp. 259 (S.D. Cal. 1953).
48. Marquez v. American Export Lines, 41 FRD 386 (SDNY 1967).
49. Sierra Club v. EPA, 769 F.2d 796 (DC Cir. 1985); In Re: Air Crash Disaster at John F. Kennedy International Airport on June 24, 1975, 687 F.2d 626 (2nd Cir. 1982); Griffith v. Mt. Carmel Medical Center, 157 F.R.D. 499 (D. Kansas 1994); Radol v. Thomas, 113 FRD 172 (SD Ohio 1986); Marquez v. American Export Lines, 41 FRD 386 (SDNY 1967).
50. Jensen v. Lawler, 338 F.Supp. 2d 739 (SD Texas 2004).
51. In re: San Juan DuPont Plaza Hotel Fire Litigation, 142 F.R.D. 41 (D.P.R. 1992); Parts & Electric Motors, Inc. v. Sterling Electric, 123 FRD 584 (ND Ill. 1988).
52. Corsair Asset Management, Inc. v. Moskovitz, 142 FRD 347 (ND Ga 1992)
53. Wahl v. Carrier Manufacturing Co., 511 F.2d 209 (7th Cir. 1975); Hollenbeck v. Falstaff Brewing Corp., 605 F.Supp. 421 (ED Mo. 1984).
54. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000).
55. Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346, 353 (1981).
56. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
57. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265, 268 (1988)(emphasis added). Accord, Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). See, also, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
58. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). Accord, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).

59. Brazos Valley Coalition for Life, Inc. v. City of Bryan, Texas, 421 F.3d 314 (5th Cir. 2005); Trepel v. Roadway Express, Inc., 266 F.3d 418 (6th Cir. 2001); Holmes v. Cessna Aircraft Co., 11 F.3d 63 (5th Cir. 1994); Dovenmuehle v. Gildorn Mortgage Midwest Corp., 871 F.2d 697 (7th Cir. 1989); Mason v. Belieu, 543 F.2d 215 (D.C. Cir. 1976); Wahl v. Carrier Manufacturing Co., 511 F.2d 209 (7th Cir. 1975); McInnis v. Town of Weston, 458 F.Supp.2d 7 (D. Conn. 2006); Sullivan v. Cheshier, 991 F.Supp. 999 (N.D. Ill. 1998); Hollenbeck v. Falstaff Brewing Corp., 605 F.Supp. 421 (E.D. Mo. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 980 (E.D. Mo. 1983).
60. In Re: Kulicke & Soffa Industries Inc. Securities Litigation, 747 F.Supp. 1136 (E.D.Pa. 1990), *aff'd*, 944 F.2d 897 (3rd Cir. 1991); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3rd Cir. 1975); Nugget Distributors Cooperative of America v. Mr. Nugget, Inc., 145 F.R.D. 54 (E.D.Pa. 1992). *Accord*, Charter Medical Corp v. Cardin, 127 F.R.D. 111 (D. Maryland 1989); Women's Federal Savings and Loan Association of Cleveland v. Nevada National Bank, 108 F.R.D. 396 (D. Nevada 1985); International Wood Processors v. Power Dry, Inc., 598 F. Supp. 299 (D.S.C. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 178 (ED Mo. 1983).
61. Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981); Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3rd Cir. 2010); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3rd Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3rd Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3rd Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3rd Cir. 1985); Pearlstine v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3rd Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3rd Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3rd Cir. 1975); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D.Pa. 1998). *Accord*, In Re: Air Crash Disaster at John F. Kennedy International Airport on June 24, 1975, 687 F.2d 626 (2nd Cir. 1982); In Re: Glacier Bay, 746 F.Supp. 1379 (D. Alaska 1990).
62. Chambers v. NASCO, Inc., 501 U.S. 32 (1991); Alyeska Pipeline Service Co. v. Wilderness Society, 421 U.S. 240 (1975).
63. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3rd Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3rd Cir. 2000); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3rd Cir. 1988); Adams v. Teamsters Local 115, 678 F.Supp.2d 314 (E.D. Pa. 2007); Montgomery County v. Microvote Corp., 2004 WL 1087196 (EDPA 2004); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D.Pa. 1998). *Accord*, McGuigan v. CAE Link Corp., 155 F.R.D. 31 (NDNY 1994).
64. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3rd Cir. 2010); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3rd Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3rd Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897, 926 (3rd Cir. 1985); Pearlstine v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3rd Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3rd Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3rd Cir. 1975); Adams v. Teamsters Local 115, 678 F.Supp.2d 314 (E.D. Pa. 2007).
65. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3rd Cir. 2010).
66. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3rd Cir. 2010); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3rd Cir. 1988); Pearlstine v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packaging Corp., 525 F.2d 662, (3rd Cir. 1975); Adams v. Teamsters Local 115, 678 F.Supp.2d 314 (E.D. Pa. 2007). *Accord*, In Re Olympia Brewing Co. Securities Litigation, 613 F.Supp. 1286, 1302 (N.D.Ill. 1985).
67. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3rd Cir. 2010).
68. Thomas v. Duralite Co., Inc., 524 F.2d 577 (3rd Cir. 1975). *Accord*, Dail v. George A. Arab, Inc., 391 F.Supp. 2d 1142 (M.D. Fla. 2005); DiCecco v. The Dillard House, Inc., 149 F.R.D. 239 (N.D.Ga. 1993); Frigiquip Corp. v. Parker-Hannifin Corp., 75 F.R.D. 605 (W.D. Okla. 1977).
69. See, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(1).
70. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Samaad v. City of Dallas, 922 F.2d 216 (5th Cir. 1991).
71. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285, 289 Footnote 3 (3rd Cir. 2010) (emphasis added).
72. Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346, 353 (1981).

73. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstine v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
74. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265, 268 (1988)(emphasis added). Accord, Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981).
75. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981); Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstine v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
76. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Adams v. Teamsters Local 115, 678 F.Supp.2d 314 (E.D. Pa. 2007); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (ED Pa. 1977). Accord, Matthew v. Crosby, 480 F.3d 1265 (11th Cir. 2007); Weaver v. Toombs, 948 F.2d 1004 (6th Cir. 1991); Perry v. Metro Suburban Bus Authority, 236 FRD 110 (EDNY 2006).
77. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); Adams v. Teamsters Local 115, 678 F.Supp.2d 314 (E.D. Pa. 2007); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (ED Pa. 1977).
78. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Adams v. Teamsters Local 115, 678 F.Supp.2d 314 (E.D. Pa. 2007); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (ED Pa. 1998).
79. Adams v. Teamsters Local 115, 678 F.Supp.2d 314 (E.D. Pa. 2007). Accord, Washington v. Patlis, 916 F.2d 1036 (5th Cir. 1990); Chevrette v. Marks, 558 F.Supp. 1133 (M.D. Pa. 1983).
80. Constitution Bank v. Tubbs, 68 F.3d 685 (3rd Cir. 1995).
81. Association of St. Croix Condominium Owners v. St. Croix Hotel Corp., 682 F.2d 446 (3rd Cir 1982).
82. Franklin Savings Association v. Office of Thrift Supervision, 31 F.3d 1020 (10th Cir. 1994); Aerotech Resources Inc. v. Dodson Aviation, Inc., 237 F.R.D. 659 (D. Kansas 2005).
83. Maritime Electric Co. v. United Jersey Bank, 959 F.2d 1194, 1205 (3rd Cir. 1991) (emphasis added). See, also, Jefferson Ward Stores, Inc. v. Doody Co., 48 BR 276 (ED Pa 1985). Accord, Farley v. Henson, 2 F.3d 273 (8th Cir. 1993); Martin-Trigona v. Champion Federal Savings and Loan Association, 892 F.2d 575 (7th Cir. 1989); Carley Capital Group v. Fireman's Fund Insurance Co., 889 F.2d 1126 (DC Cir 1989).
84. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285, 289 (3d Cir. 2010)(emphasis added).
85. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010)(emphasis added).

86. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988). Accord, Samaad v. City of Dallas, 922 F.2d 216 (5th Cir. 1991).
87. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); Adams v. Teamsters Local 115, 678 F.Supp.2d 314 (E.D. Pa. 2007); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
88. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265, 268 (1988)(emphasis added). Accord, Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). See, also, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
89. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). Accord, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
90. Brazos Valley Coalition for Life, Inc. v. City of Bryan, Texas, 421 F.3d 314 (5th Cir. 2005); Trepel v. Roadway Express, Inc., 266 F.3d 418 (6th Cir. 2001); Holmes v. Cessna Aircraft Co., 11 F.3d 63 (5th Cir. 1994); Dovenmuehle v. Gildorn Mortgage Midwest Corp., 871 F.2d 697 (7th Cir. 1989); Mason v. Belieu, 543 F.2d 215 (D.C. Cir. 1976); Wahl v. Carrier Manufacturing Co., 511 F.2d 209 (7th Cir. 1975); McInnis v. Town of Weston, 458 F.Supp.2d 7 (D. Conn. 2006); Sullivan v. Cheshier, 991 F.Supp. 999 (N.D. Ill. 1998); Hollenbeck v. Falstaff Brewing Corp., 605 F.Supp. 421 (E.D. Mo. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 980 (E.D. Mo. 1983).
91. In Re: Kulicke & Soffa Industries Inc. Securities Litigation, 747 F.Supp. 1136 (E.D.Pa. 1990), aff'd, 944 F.2d 897 (3rd Cir. 1991); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); Nugget Distributors Cooperative of America v. Mr. Nugget, Inc., 145 F.R.D. 54 (E.D.Pa. 1992). Accord, Charter Medical Corp v. Cardin, 127 F.R.D. 111 (D. Maryland 1989); Women's Federal Savings and Loan Association of Cleveland v. Nevada National Bank, 108 F.R.D. 396 (D. Nevada 1985); International Wood Processors v. Power Dry, Inc., 598 F. Supp. 299 (D.S.C. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 178 (ED Mo. 1983).
92. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285, 289 Footnote 3 (3d Cir. 2010) (emphasis added).
93. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988). Accord, McGuigan v. CAE Link Corp., 155 F.R.D. 31 (NDNY 1994).
94. Maldonado v. Parasole, 66 F.R.D. 388,390 (EDNY 1975). Accord, Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (ED Pa. 1998). See, also, McGuigan v. CAE Link Corp., 155 F.R.D. 31 (NDNY 1994); Phillips v. Cameron Tool Corp., 131 F.R.D. 151 (SD Ind. 1990).

95. Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988). See, also, Popeil Brothers v. Schick Electric, 516 F.2d 772 (7th Cir. 1975); McGuigan v. Cae Lank Corp., 155 F.R.D. 31 (NDNY 1994); Phillips v. Cameron Tool Corp., 131 F.R.D. 151 (S.D. Ind. 1990); Maldonado v. Parasole, 66 F.R.D. 388,390 (EDNY 1975).
96. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010). Accord, Samaad v. City of Dallas, 922 F.2d 216 (5th Cir. 1991).
97. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998). Accord, McGuigan v. Cae Lank Corp., 155 F.R.D. 31 (NDNY 1994); Phillips v. Cameron Tool Corp., 131 F.R.D. 151 (S.D. Ind. 1990); Maldonado v. Parasole, 66 F.R.D. 388,390 (EDNY 1975).
98. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstine v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); Adams v. Teamsters Local 115, 678 F.Supp.2d 314 (E.D. Pa. 2007); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
99. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265, 268 (1988)(emphasis added). Accord, Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). See, also, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstine v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
100. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). Accord, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstine v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
101. Brazos Valley Coalition for Life, Inc. v. City of Bryan, Texas, 421 F.3d 314 (5th Cir. 2005); Trepel v. Roadway Express, Inc., 266 F.3d 418 (6th Cir. 2001); Holmes v. Cessna Aircraft Co., 11 F.3d 63 (5th Cir. 1994); Dovenmuehle v. Gildorn Mortgage Midwest Corp., 871 F.2d 697 (7th Cir. 1989); Mason v. Belieu, 543 F.2d 215 (D.C. Cir. 1976); Wahl v. Carrier Manufacturing Co., 511 F.2d 209 (7th Cir. 1975); McInnis v. Town of Weston, 458 F.Supp.2d 7 (D. Conn. 2006); Sullivan v. Cheshier, 991 F.Supp. 999 (N.D. Ill. 1998); Hollenbeck v. Falstaff Brewing Corp., 605 F.Supp. 421 (E.D. Mo. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 980 (E.D. Mo. 1983).
102. In Re: Kulicke & Soffa Industries Inc. Securities Litigation, 747 F.Supp. 1136 (E.D.Pa. 1990), *aff'd*, 944 F.2d 897 (3rd Cir. 1991); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); Nugget Distributors Cooperative of America v. Mr. Nugget, Inc., 145 F.R.D. 54 (E.D.Pa. 1992). Accord, Charter Medical Corp v. Cardin, 127 F.R.D. 111 (D. Maryland 1989); Women's Federal Savings and Loan Association of Cleveland v. Nevada National Bank, 108 F.R.D. 396 (D. Nevada 1985); International Wood Processors v. Power Dry, Inc., 598 F. Supp. 299 (D.S.C. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 178 (ED Mo. 1983).
103. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285, 289 Footnote 3 (3d Cir. 2010) (emphasis added).

104. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010). Accord, Samaad v. City of Dallas, 922 F.2d 216 (5th Cir. 1991).
105. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998). Accord, McGuigan v. Cae Lank Corp., 155 F.R.D. 31 (NDNY 1994); Phillips v. Cameron Tool Corp., 131 F.R.D. 151 (S.D. Ind. 1990); Maldonado v. Parasole, 66 F.R.D. 388,390 (EDNY 1975).
106. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3d Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); Adams v. Teamsters Local 115, 678 F.Supp.2d 314 (E.D. Pa. 2007); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
107. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265, 268 (1988)(emphasis added). Accord, Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). See, also, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3d Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
108. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). Accord, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3d Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
109. Brazos Valley Coalition for Life, Inc. v. City of Bryan, Texas, 421 F.3d 314 (5th Cir. 2005); Trepel v. Roadway Express, Inc., 266 F.3d 418 (6th Cir. 2001); Holmes v. Cessna Aircraft Co., 11 F.3d 63 (5th Cir. 1994); Dovenmuehle v. Gildorn Mortgage Midwest Corp., 871 F.2d 697 (7th Cir. 1989); Mason v. Belieu, 543 F.2d 215 (D.C. Cir. 1976); Wahl v. Carrier Manufacturing Co., 511 F.2d 209 (7th Cir. 1975); McInnis v. Town of Weston, 458 F.Supp.2d 7 (D. Conn. 2006); Sullivan v. Cheshier, 991 F.Supp. 999 (N.D. Ill. 1998); Hollenbeck v. Falstaff Brewing Corp., 605 F.Supp. 421 (E.D. Mo. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 980 (E.D. Mo. 1983).
110. In Re: Kulicke & Soffa Industries Inc. Securities Litigation, 747 F.Supp. 1136 (E.D.Pa. 1990), aff'd, 944 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1991); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); Nugget Distributors Cooperative of America v. Mr. Nugget, Inc., 145 F.R.D. 54 (E.D.Pa. 1992). Accord, Charter Medical Corp v. Cardin, 127 F.R.D. 111 (D. Maryland 1989); Women's Federal Savings and Loan Association of Cleveland v. Nevada National Bank, 108 F.R.D. 396 (D. Nevada 1985); International Wood Processors v. Power Dry, Inc., 598 F. Supp. 299 (D.S.C. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 178 (ED Mo. 1983).
111. United States v. Hoffa, 497 F.2d 294 (7th Cir. 1974); Radol v. Thomas, 113 F.R.D. 172 (SD Ohio 1986).
112. Radol v. Thomas, 113 F.R.D. 172 (SD Ohio 1986).
113. Brown v. American Enka Corp., 452 F.Supp. 154 (ED Tenn. 1976).

114. Brown v. American Enka Corp., 452 F.Supp. 154 (ED Tenn. 1976).
115. In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897, 926 (3rd Cir. 1985).
116. In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897, 926 (3rd Cir. 1985).
117. ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packaging Corp., 525 F.2d 662, 664 (3rd Cir. 1975).
118. Race Tires America, Inc. v. Hoosier Racing Tire Corp., 2012 WL 887593 (3d Cir. March 16, 2012).
119. Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897, 926 (3rd Cir. 1985).
120. In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897, 926 (3rd Cir. 1985); Montgomery County v. Microvote Corp., 2004 WL 1087196 (EDPA 2004); Lacovara v. Merrill Lynch, 102 F.R.D. 959 (ED Pa. 1984). Accord, Zackaroff v. Koch Transfer Co., 862 F.2d 1263 (6th Cir. 1988); First Community Traders, Inc. v. Heinold Commodities, Inc., 766 F.2d 1007 (7th Cir. 1985); Friends for All Children v. Lockheed Aircraft Corp., 725 F.2d 1392 (DC Cir. 1984); Superturf, Inc. v. Monsanto Co., 660 F.2d 1275 (8th Cir. 1981); Jones v. Diamond, 594 F.2d 997 (4th Cir. 1979); U.S. v. Mitchell, 580 F.2d 789 (5th Cir. 1978); K-2 Ski Co. v. Head Ski Co., 506 F.2d 47 (9th Cir. 1974); Garonzik v. Whitman Diner, 910 F.Supp. 167 (D.N.J. 1995); Weseloh-Hurtig v. Hepker, 152 F.R.D. 198 (D. Kansas 1993); Bruno v. Western Electric Co., 618 F.Supp. 398 (D. Colorado 1985); Seber v. Daniels Transfer Co., 618 F.Supp. 1311 (W.D. Pa. 1985); Wade v. Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service, 64 F.R.D. 102 (N.D.Miss. 1974); Sperry Rand Corp. v. A-T-O, Inc., 58 F.R.D. 132 (E.D.Va. 1973).
121. In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897, 926 (3rd Cir. 1985).
122. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Samaad v. City of Dallas, 922 F.2d 216 (5th Cir. 1991).
123. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265, 268 (1988)(emphasis added). Accord, Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). See also, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstine v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
124. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897, 926 (3rd Cir. 1985); Pearlstine v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975).
125. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010).
126. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010).
127. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Samaad v. City of Dallas, 922 F.2d 216 (5th Cir. 1991).
128. Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897, 911 (3rd Cir. 1985). The Third Circuit in Institutionalized Juveniles first applied this standard to attorney fees, and then held that it also applies to 28 U.S.C. §1920 costs. Accord, Montgomery County v. Microvote Corp., 2004 WL 1087196 (E.D.Pa. 2004).

129. Montgomery County v. Microvote Corp., 2004 WL 1087196 (E.D.Pa. 2004); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Lacovara v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, 102 F.R.D. 959 (E.D. Pa. 1984). See, also, Hines v. Perez, 242 F.2d 459 (9th Cir. 1957); Garonzik v. Whitman Diner, 910 F.Supp. 167 (D.N.J. 1995); Sperry Rand Corp. v. A-T-O, Inc., 58 F.R.D. 132 (E.D.Va. 1973).
130. Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897, 910 (3rd Cir. 1985). The Third Circuit in Institutionalized Juveniles first applied this standard to attorney fees, and then held that it also applies to 28 U.S.C. §1920 costs. Accord, Montgomery County v. Microvote Corp., 2004 WL 1087196 (E.D.Pa. 2004).
131. Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3rd Cir. 1985); Montgomery County v. Microvote Corp., 2004 WL 1087196 (EDPA 2004); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (ED Pa. 1998). Accord, Roberts v. Interstate Distrib. Co., 242 F.Supp. 2d 850 (D. Oregon 2002); Garonzik v. Whitman Diner, 910 F.Supp. 167 (D.N.J. 1995); Green Construction Co. v. Kansas Power and Light Co., 153 F.R.D. 670 (D. Kansas 1994); Weseloh-Hurtig v. Hepker, 152 F.R.D. 198 (D. Kansas 1993).
132. Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Montgomery County v. Microvote Corp., 2004 WL 1087196 (EDPA 2004). Accord, Zackaroff v. Koch Transfer Co., 862 F.2d 1263 (6th Cir. 1988); First Community Traders, Inc. v. Heinold Commodities, Inc., 766 F.2d 1007 (7th Cir. 1985); Friends for All Children v. Lockheed Aircraft Corp., 725 F.2d 1392 (DC Cir. 1984); Superturf, Inc. v. Monsanto Co., 660 F.2d 1275 (8th Cir. 1981); Jones v. Diamond, 594 F.2d 997 (4th Cir. 1979); U.S. v. Mitchell, 580 F.2d 789 (5th Cir. 1978); K-2 Ski Co. v. Head Ski Co., 506 F.2d 47 (9th Cir. 1974); Garonzik v. Whitman Diner, 910 F.Supp. 167 (D.N.J. 1995); Weseloh-Hurtig v. Hepker, 152 F.R.D. 198 (D. Kansas 1993); Bruno v. Western Electric Co., 618 F.Supp. 398 (D. Colorado 1985); Seber v. Daniels Transfer Co., 618 F.Supp. 1311 (W.D. Pa. 1985); Wade v. Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service, 64 F.R.D. 102 (N.D.Miss. 1974); Sperry Rand Corp. v. A-T-O, Inc., 58 F.R.D. 132 (E.D.Va. 1973).
133. Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (ED Pa. 1998); Lacovara v. Merrill Lynch, 102 F.R.D. 959 (ED Pa. 1984). Accord, Scientific Holding Co. v. Plessey, 510 F.2d 15 (2nd Cir. 1974).
134. Lacovara v. Merrill Lynch, 102 F.R.D. 959 (ED Pa. 1984). Accord, Scientific Holding Co. v. Plessey, 510 F.2d 15 (2nd Cir. 1974).
135. Brandt v. Schal Associates, 854 F.2d 948 (7th Cir. 1988); Bishop v. West American Insurance Co., 95 F.R.D. 494 (N.D.Ga. 1982).
136. City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (ED Pa. 1999); Lacovara v. Merrill Lynch, 102 F.R.D. 959 (ED Pa. 1984).
137. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Samaad v. City of Dallas, 922 F.2d 216 (5th Cir. 1991).
138. Mitchell v. City of Moore, Oklahoma, 218 F.3d 1190 (10th Cir. 2000); Stearns Airport Equipment Co., Inc. v. FMC Corporation, 170 F.3d 518 (5th Cir. 1999); Cengr v. Fusibond Piping Systems, Inc., 135 F.3d 445 (7th Cir. 1998); Johnson v. Henderson, 67 F.3d 299 (6th Cir. 1995); Sevenson Environmental Services, Inc. v. Shaw Environmental, Inc., 246 F.R.D. 154 (WDNY 2007); Yasui v. Maui Electric Company, 78 F.Supp.2d 1124 (D. Hawaii 1999); Woolfson v. Doyle, 180 F.Supp. 86 (SDNY 1960).
139. LaVay Corporation v. Dominion Federal Savings and Loan, 830 F.2d 522 (4th Cir. 1987).
140. Neumann v. Reinforced Earth Company, 109 FRD 698 (DDC 1986).
141. Furman v. Cirrito, 782 F.2d 353 (2d Cir. 1986); Knox v. Schweiker, 567 F.Supp. 959 (D.Del. 1983).
142. Women's Federal Savings and Loan Association of Cleveland v. Nevada National Bank, 108 F.R.D. 396 (D. Nevada 1985).
143. McInnis v. Town of Weston, 458 F.Supp.2d 7 (D. Conn 2006); Sullivan v. Cheshier, 991 F.Supp. (ND Ill. 1998); McGuigan v. CAE Link Corp., 155 F.R.D. 31 (NDNY 1994).
144. McInnis v. Town of Weston, 458 F.Supp.2d 7 (D. Conn 2006).

145. Harkins v. Riverboat Services, 286 F.Supp. 2d 976 (ND Ill. 2003), aff'd, 385 F.3d 1099 (7th Cir. 2004); McGuigan v. CAE Link Corp., 155 F.R.D. 31 (N.D.N.Y. 1994); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F. Supp. 980 (E.D. Mo. 1983); Harceg v. Brown, 536 F.Supp. 125 (N.D. Ill. 1982). Accord, Seidman v. American Mobile Systems, 965 F.Supp. 612 (E.D. Pa. 1997).
146. Brazos Valley Coalition for Life, Inc. v. City of Bryan, Texas, 421 F.3d 314 (5th Cir. 2005); Trepel v. Roadway Express, Inc., 266 F.3d 418 (6th Cir. 2001); Holmes v. Cessna Aircraft Co., 11 F.3d 63 (5th Cir. 1994); Dovenmuehle v. Gildorn Mortgage Midwest Corp., 871 F.2d 697 (7th Cir. 1989); Mason v. Belieu, 543 F.2d 215 (D.C. Cir. 1976); Wahl v. Carrier Manufacturing Co., 511 F.2d 209 (7th Cir. 1975); McInnis v. Town of Weston, 458 F.Supp.2d 7 (D. Conn. 2006); Sullivan v. Cheshier, 991 F.Supp. 999 (N.D. Ill. 1998); Hollenbeck v. Falstaff Brewing Corp., 605 F.Supp. 421 (E.D. Mo. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 980 (E.D. Mo. 1983).
147. Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988).
148. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Adams v. Teamsters Local 115, 678 F.Supp.2d 314 (E.D.Pa, 2007).
149. Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Dr. Bernard Heller Foundation v. Lee, 847 F.2d 83 (3rd Cir. 1988); Dominic v. Hess Oil V.I. Corp., 841 F.2d 513 (3rd Cir. 1988).
150. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Adams v. Teamsters Local 115, 678 F.Supp.2d 314 (E.D.Pa, 2007); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998).
151. Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Dr. Bernard Heller Foundation v. Lee, 847 F.2d 83 (3rd Cir. 1988); Dominic v. Hess Oil V.I. Corp., 841 F.2d 513 (3rd Cir. 1988).
152. Women's Federal Savings and Loan Association of Cleveland v. Nevada National Bank, 108 F.R.D. 396 (D. Nevada 1985).
153. In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000). Accord, Tubbs v. Sacramento County Jail, 258 F.R.D. 657 (E.D. Cal. 2009); Electronic Specialty Co. v. International Controls Corp., 47 F.R.D. 158 (SDNY 1969).
154. Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995).
155. P.L. 102-572.
156. Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3rd Cir. 1976); Halderman v. Pennhurst State School and Hospital, 533 F.Supp. 631, 639 (E.D. Pa. 1981). See, also, Gay Students Services v. Texas A&M University, 612 F.2d 160, 165 (5th Cir. 1980); Gary W. v. Louisiana, 601 F.2d 240 (5th Cir. 1979); Kovats v. Rutgers, 633 F.Supp. 1469, 1475 (D.N.J. 1986).
157. Copperweld Steel Co. v. DeMag-Mannesmann-Bohler, 624 F.2d 7 (3rd Cir. 1980).
158. American Truck Assoc., Inc. v. I.C.C., 666 F.2d 167, 169 (5th Cir. 1982); American Railway Supervisors Association v. United States, 582 F.2d 1066, 1067 (7th Cir. 1978); Delta Airlines, Inc. v. Civil Aeronautics Board, 505 F.2d 386 (D.C. Cir.1974); Smith v. Board of School Commissioners of Mobile County, 119 F.R.D. 440, 443 (S.D. Ala. 1988); Monroe v. United Air Lines, Inc., 565 F.Supp. 274 (N.D.Ill 1983).
159. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988).
160. Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Dr. Bernard Heller Foundation v. Lee, 847 F.2d 83 (3rd Cir. 1988); Dominic v. Hess Oil V.I. Corp., 841 F.2d 513 (3rd Cir. 1988).
161. Proffitt v. Municipal Authority of Borough of Morrisville, 716 F.Supp. 845 (E.D. Pa. 1989), aff'd, 897 F.2d 523 (3d Cir. 1990); Nugget Distributors Cooperative of America v. Mr. Nugget, Inc., 145 F.R.D. 54 (E.D.Pa. 1992). Accord, East v. Barnhart, 377 F.Supp. 2d 1170 (MD Alabama 2003); United States v. Orenic, 110 F.R.D. 584 (W.D. Va. 1986); Bishop v. West American Insurance Co., 95 F.R.D. 494 (N.D.Ga. 1982).

162. McGuigan v. CAE Link Corp., 155 F.R.D. 31 (N.D.N.Y. 1994); Bishop v. West American Insurance Co., 95 F.R.D. 494 (N.D.Ga. 1982).
163. United States Public Law 102-572.
164. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
165. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265, 268 (1988)(emphasis added). Accord, Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). See also, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
166. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). Accord, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
167. Brazos Valley Coalition for Life, Inc. v. City of Bryan, Texas, 421 F.3d 314 (5th Cir. 2005); Trepel v. Roadway Express, Inc., 266 F.3d 418 (6th Cir. 2001); Holmes v. Cessna Aircraft Co., 11 F.3d 63 (5th Cir. 1994); Dovenmuehle v. Gildorn Mortgage Midwest Corp., 871 F.2d 697 (7th Cir. 1989); Mason v. Belieu, 543 F.2d 215 (D.C. Cir. 1976); Wahl v. Carrier Manufacturing Co., 511 F.2d 209 (7th Cir. 1975); McInnis v. Town of Weston, 458 F.Supp.2d 7 (D. Conn. 2006); Sullivan v. Cheshier, 991 F.Supp. 999 (N.D. Ill. 1998); Hollenbeck v. Falstaff Brewing Corp., 605 F.Supp. 421 (E.D. Mo. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 980 (E.D. Mo. 1983).
168. In Re: Kulicke & Soffa Industries Inc. Securities Litigation, 747 F.Supp. 1136 (E.D.Pa. 1990), aff'd, 944 F.2d 897 (3rd Cir. 1991); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); Nugget Distributors Cooperative of America v. Mr. Nugget, Inc., 145 F.R.D. 54 (E.D.Pa. 1992). Accord, Charter Medical Corp v. Cardin, 127 F.R.D. 111 (D. Maryland 1989); Women's Federal Savings and Loan Association of Cleveland v. Nevada National Bank, 108 F.R.D. 396 (D. Nevada 1985); International Wood Processors v. Power Dry, Inc., 598 F. Supp. 299 (D.S.C. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 178 (ED Mo. 1983).
169. Proffitt v. Municipal Authority of Borough of Morrisville, 716 F.Supp. 845 (ED Pa. 1989), aff'd, 897 F.2d 523 (3d Cir. 1990); Montgomery County v. Microvote Corp., 2004 WL 1087196 (EDPA 2004). Accord, Long v. Howard University, 561 F.Supp.2d 85 (D.D.C. 2008); Shared Medical System v. Ashford Presbyterian Community Hospital, 212 F.R.D. 50 (D.P.R. 2002); McGuigan v. CAE Link Corp., 155 F.R.D. 31 (NDNY 1994).
170. Montgomery County v. Microvote Corp., 2004 WL 1087196 (EDPA 2004). Accord, Shared Medical System v. Ashford Presbyterian Community Hospital, 212 F.R.D. 50 (D.P.R. 2002); Griffith v. Mt. Carmel Medical Center, 157 F.R.D. 499 (D. Kansas 1994); McGuigan v. CAE Link Corp., 155 F.R.D. 31 (NDNY 1994).
171. Movitz v. First National Bank of Chicago, 982 F.Supp. 571 (ND Ill 1997).
172. Montgomery County v. Microvote Corp., 2004 WL 1087196 (EDPA 2004).

173. Montgomery County v. Microvote Corp., 2004 WL 1087196 (EDPA 2004); McGuigan v. CAE Link Corp., 155 FRD 31 (NDNY 1994).
174. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
175. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265, 268 (1988)(emphasis added). Accord, Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). See, also, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
176. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). Accord, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
177. Brazos Valley Coalition for Life, Inc. v. City of Bryan, Texas, 421 F.3d 314 (5th Cir. 2005); Trepel v. Roadway Express, Inc., 266 F.3d 418 (6th Cir. 2001); Holmes v. Cessna Aircraft Co., 11 F.3d 63 (5th Cir. 1994); Dovenmuehle v. Gildorn Mortgage Midwest Corp., 871 F.2d 697 (7th Cir. 1989); Mason v. Belieu, 543 F.2d 215 (D.C. Cir. 1976); Wahl v. Carrier Manufacturing Co., 511 F.2d 209 (7th Cir. 1975); McInnis v. Town of Weston, 458 F.Supp.2d 7 (D. Conn. 2006); Sullivan v. Cheshier, 991 F.Supp. 999 (N.D. Ill. 1998); Hollenbeck v. Falstaff Brewing Corp., 605 F.Supp. 421 (E.D. Mo. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 980 (E.D. Mo. 1983).
178. In Re: Kulicke & Soffa Industries Inc. Securities Litigation, 747 F.Supp. 1136 (E.D.Pa. 1990), aff'd, 944 F.2d 897 (3rd Cir. 1991); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); Nugget Distributors Cooperative of America v. Mr. Nugget, Inc., 145 F.R.D. 54 (E.D.Pa. 1992). Accord, Charter Medical Corp v. Cardin, 127 F.R.D. 111 (D. Maryland 1989); Women's Federal Savings and Loan Association of Cleveland v. Nevada National Bank, 108 F.R.D. 396 (D. Nevada 1985); International Wood Processors v. Power Dry, Inc., 598 F. Supp. 299 (D.S.C. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 178 (ED Mo. 1983).
179. In Re: Kulicke & Soffa Industries, Inc. Securities Litigation, 747 F.Supp. 1136 (ED Pa. 1990) aff'd 944 F.2d 897 (3rd Cir. 1991); Montgomery County v. Microvote Corp., 2004 WL 1087196 (EDPA 2004); Nugget Distributors Cooperative v. Mr. Nugget, Inc., 145 F.R.D. 54 (ED Pa. 1992). Accord, McGuigan v. CAE Link Corp., 155 F.R.D. 31 (NDNY 1994).
180. BDT Products, Inc. v. Lexmark International, Inc., 405 F.3d 415 (6th Cir. 2005); Tilton v. Capital Cities/ABC Inc., 115 F.3d 1471 (10th Cir. 1997); Morrison v. Reichhold Chems., 97 F.3d 460 (11th Cir. 1996); Commercial Credit Equipment Corp. v. Stamps, 920 F.2d 1361 (7th Cir. 1990); Rio Props v. Stewart Annoyances, Ltd., 420 F.Supp. 2d 1127 (D. Nevada 2006); United International Holdings v. Wharf, Ltd., 174 F.R.D. 479 (D. Colo. 1997); Garonzik v. Whitman Diner, 910 F.Supp 167 (D.N.J. 1995); McGuigan v. CAE Link Corp., 155 F.R.D. 31 (NDNY 1994); Weseloh-Hurtig v. Hepker, 152 F.R.D. 198 (D. Kansas 1993); Deaton v. Dreis & Krump Mfg. Co. (ND Ohio 1991).

181. Garonzik v. Whitman Diner, 910 F.Supp. 167 (D.N.J. 1995).
182. Although 28 U.S.C. §1920 does limit the payment of fees to an expert witness, 28 U.S.C. §1920 does not contain a limit on the payment of fees to a court reporter in connection to the testimony of an expert witness.
183. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
184. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265, 268 (1988)(emphasis added). Accord, Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). See also, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
185. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). Accord, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
186. Brazos Valley Coalition for Life, Inc. v. City of Bryan, Texas, 421 F.3d 314 (5th Cir. 2005); Trepel v. Roadway Express, Inc., 266 F.3d 418 (6th Cir. 2001); Holmes v. Cessna Aircraft Co., 11 F.3d 63 (5th Cir. 1994); Dovenmuehle v. Gildorn Mortgage Midwest Corp., 871 F.2d 697 (7th Cir. 1989); Mason v. Belieu, 543 F.2d 215 (D.C. Cir. 1976); Wahl v. Carrier Manufacturing Co., 511 F.2d 209 (7th Cir. 1975); McInnis v. Town of Weston, 458 F.Supp.2d 7 (D. Conn. 2006); Sullivan v. Cheshire, 991 F.Supp. 999 (N.D. Ill. 1998); Hollenbeck v. Falstaff Brewing Corp., 605 F.Supp. 421 (E.D. Mo. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 980 (E.D. Mo. 1983).
187. In Re: Kulicke & Soffa Industries Inc. Securities Litigation, 747 F.Supp. 1136 (E.D.Pa. 1990), aff'd, 944 F.2d 897 (3rd Cir. 1991); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); Nugget Distributors Cooperative of America v. Mr. Nugget, Inc., 145 F.R.D. 54 (E.D.Pa. 1992). Accord, Charter Medical Corp v. Cardin, 127 F.R.D. 111 (D. Maryland 1989); Women's Federal Savings and Loan Association of Cleveland v. Nevada National Bank, 108 F.R.D. 396 (D. Nevada 1985); International Wood Processors v. Power Dry, Inc., 598 F. Supp. 299 (D.S.C. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 178 (ED Mo. 1983).
188. In Re: Kulicke & Soffa Industries, Inc. Securities Litigation, 747 F.Supp. 1136 (ED Pa. 1990) aff'd 944 F.2d 897 (3rd Cir. 1991).
189. Sullivan v. Cheshire, 991 F.Supp. 999 (ND Ill. 1998).
190. In Re: Kulicke & Soffa Industries Inc. Securities Litigation, 747 F.Supp. 1136 (E.D.Pa. 1990), aff'd, 944 F.2d 897 (3rd Cir. 1991).
191. In Re: Kulicke & Soffa Industries Inc. Securities Litigation, 747 F.Supp. 1136 (E.D.Pa. 1990), aff'd, 944 F.2d 897 (3rd Cir. 1991).

192. Mitchell v. City of Moore, Oklahoma, 218 F.3d 1190 (10th Cir. 2000); Stearns Airport Equipment Co., Inc. v. FMC Corporation, 170 F.3d 518 (5th Cir. 1999); Cengr v. Fusibond Piping Systems, Inc., 135 F.3d 445 (7th Cir. 1998); Sevenson Environmental Services, Inc. v. Shaw Environmental, Inc., 246 F.R.D. 154 (WDNY 2007); Yasui v. Maui Electric Company, 78 F.Supp.2d 1124 (D. Hawaii 1999).
193. LaVay Corporation v. Dominion Federal Savings and Loan, 830 F.2d 522 (4th Cir. 1987).
194. Neumann v. Reinforced Earth Company, 109 FRD 698 (DDC 1986).
195. BDT Products, Inc. v. Lexmark International, Inc., 405 F.3d 415 (6th Cir. 2005); Tilton v. Capital Cities/ABC, Inc., 115 F.3d 1471 (10th Cir. 1997); Garonzik v. Whitman Diner, 910 F.Supp. 167 (D.N.J. 1995).
196. In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3rd Cir. 2000); In Re: Kulicke & Soffa Industries Inc. Securities Litigation, 747 F.Supp. 1136 (E.D.Pa. 1990), aff'd, 944 F.2d 897 (3rd Cir. 1991); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); Nugget Distributors Cooperative of America v. Mr. Nugget, Inc., 145 F.R.D. 54 (E.D.Pa. 1992). Accord, Charter Medical Corp v. Cardin, 127 F.R.D. 111 (D. Maryland 1989); Women's Federal Savings and Loan Association of Cleveland v. Nevada National Bank, 108 FRD 396 (D. Nevada 1985); International Wood Processors v. Power Dry, Inc., 598 F. Supp. 299 (D.S.C. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 178 (ED Mo. 1983).
197. McGuigan v. CAE Link Corp., 155 F.R.D. 31 (NDNY 1994).
198. In Re: Kulicke & Soffa Industries Inc. Securities Litigation, 747 F.Supp. 1136 (E.D.Pa. 1990), aff'd, 944 F.2d 897 (3rd Cir. 1991); Montgomery County v. Microvote Corp., 2004 WL 1087196 (E.D.Pa 2004). Accord, Holmes v. Cessna Aircraft Co., 11 F.3d 63 (5th Cir. 1994).
199. Montgomery County v. Microvote Corp., 2004 WL 1087196 (E.D.Pa. 2004). Accord, Weeks v. Samsung Heavy Industries, 126 F.3d1997); Karsian v. Inter Regional Financial Group, Inc., 13 F.Supp.2d 1085 (D. Colorado 1998); Movitz v. First National Bank of Chicago, 982 F.Supp. 571 (ND Ill. 1997); Marcoin, Inc. v. Edwin K. Williams & Co., Inc., 88 FRD 588 (E.D.Va. 1980); Electronic Specialty Co. v. International Controls Corp., 47 FRD 158 (SDNY 1969).
200. Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 980 (ED Mo. 1983).
201. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstine v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
202. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265, 268 (1988)(emphasis added). Accord, Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). See also, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstine v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).

203. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). Accord, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3d Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
204. Brazos Valley Coalition for Life, Inc. v. City of Bryan, Texas, 421 F.3d 314 (5th Cir. 2005); Trepel v. Roadway Express, Inc., 266 F.3d 418 (6th Cir. 2001); Holmes v. Cessna Aircraft Co., 11 F.3d 63 (5th Cir. 1994); Dovenmuehle v. Gildorn Mortgage Midwest Corp., 871 F.2d 697 (7th Cir. 1989); Mason v. Belieu, 543 F.2d 215 (D.C. Cir. 1976); Wahl v. Carrier Manufacturing Co., 511 F.2d 209 (7th Cir. 1975); McInnis v. Town of Weston, 458 F.Supp.2d 7 (D. Conn. 2006); Sullivan v. Cheshier, 991 F.Supp. 999 (N.D. Ill. 1998); Hollenbeck v. Falstaff Brewing Corp., 605 F.Supp. 421 (E.D. Mo. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 980 (E.D. Mo. 1983).
205. In Re: Kulicke & Soffa Industries Inc. Securities Litigation, 747 F.Supp. 1136 (E.D.Pa. 1990), aff'd, 944 F.2d 897 (3rd Cir. 1991); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); Nugget Distributors Cooperative of America v. Mr. Nugget, Inc., 145 F.R.D. 54 (E.D.Pa. 1992). Accord, Charter Medical Corp v. Cardin, 127 F.R.D. 111 (D. Maryland 1989); Women's Federal Savings and Loan Association of Cleveland v. Nevada National Bank, 108 F.R.D. 396 (D. Nevada 1985); International Wood Processors v. Power Dry, Inc., 598 F. Supp. 299 (D.S.C. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 178 (ED Mo. 1983).
206. In Re: Kulicke & Soffa Industries Inc. Securities Litigation, 747 F.Supp. 1136 (E.D.Pa. 1990), aff'd, 944 F.2d 897 (3rd Cir. 1991).
207. In Re: Kulicke & Soffa Industries Inc. Securities Litigation, 747 F.Supp. 1136 (E.D.Pa. 1990), aff'd, 944 F.2d 897 (3rd Cir. 1991).
208. In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Montgomery County v. Microvote Corp., 2004 WL 1087196 (EDPA 2004); Tracy v. Goldberg, 203 F.Supp. 188 (E.D. Pa. 1962). See, also, Charter Medical Corp. v. Cardin, 127 F.R.D. 111 (D. Maryland 1989); Harrisburg Coalition Against Ruining the Environment v. Volpe, 65 F.R.D. 608 (M.D. Pa. 1974).
209. Proffitt v. Municipal Authority of Borough of Morrisville, 716 F.Supp. 845 (E.D. Pa. 1989), aff'd, 897 F.2d 523 (3d Cir. 1990); Shannon v. United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, 433 F.Supp. 249 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
210. In Re: Glacier Bay, 746 F.Supp. 1379 (D. Alaska 1990).
211. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3d Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
212. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265, 268 (1988)(emphasis added). Accord, Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). See, also, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3d Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).

213. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). Accord, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3d Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
214. Brazos Valley Coalition for Life, Inc. v. City of Bryan, Texas, 421 F.3d 314 (5th Cir. 2005); Trepel v. Roadway Express, Inc., 266 F.3d 418 (6th Cir. 2001); Holmes v. Cessna Aircraft Co., 11 F.3d 63 (5th Cir. 1994); Dovenmuehle v. Gildorn Mortgage Midwest Corp., 871 F.2d 697 (7th Cir. 1989); Mason v. Belieu, 543 F.2d 215 (D.C. Cir. 1976); Wahl v. Carrier Manufacturing Co., 511 F.2d 209 (7th Cir. 1975); McInnis v. Town of Weston, 458 F.Supp.2d 7 (D. Conn. 2006); Sullivan v. Cheshier, 991 F.Supp. 999 (N.D. Ill. 1998); Hollenbeck v. Falstaff Brewing Corp., 605 F.Supp. 421 (E.D. Mo. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 980 (E.D. Mo. 1983).
215. In Re: Kulicke & Soffa Industries Inc. Securities Litigation, 747 F.Supp. 1136 (E.D.Pa. 1990), aff'd, 944 F.2d 897 (3rd Cir. 1991); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); Nugget Distributors Cooperative of America v. Mr. Nugget, Inc., 145 F.R.D. 54 (E.D.Pa. 1992). Accord, Charter Medical Corp v. Cardin, 127 FRD 111 (D. Maryland 1989); Women's Federal Savings and Loan Association of Cleveland v. Nevada National Bank, 108 FRD 396 (D. Nevada 1985); International Wood Processors v. Power Dry, Inc., 598 F. Supp. 299 (D.S.C. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 178 (ED Mo. 1983).
216. Kansas v. Colorado, 129 S.Ct. 1294 (2009).
217. Crawford Fitting Company v. I. T. Gibbons, Inc., 482 U.S. 437 (1987); Henkel v. Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis and Omaha Railroad Company, 284 U.S. 444 (1932).
218. Griffith v. Mt. Carmel Medical Center, 157 F.R.D. 499 (D. Kansas 1994).
219. Brazos Valley Coalition for Life, Inc. v. City of Bryan, Texas, 421 F.3d 314 (5th Cir. 2005); Trepel v. Montgomery County v. Microvote Corp., 2004 WL 1087196 (EDPA 2004); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998). Accord, Nissho-Iwai Co. v. Occidental Crude Sales, 729 F.2d 1530 (5th Cir. 1984); Quy v. Air America, Inc., 667 F.2d 1059 (D.C. Cir. 1981); Karsian v. Inter Regional Financial Group, Inc., 13 F.Supp.2d 1085 (D. Colorado 1998); Marino v. Town of Kirkland, 146 F.R.D. 49 (N.D.N.Y. 1993); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F. Supp. 980 (E.D. Mo. 1983); Independence Tube Corp. v. Copperweld Corp., 543 F.Supp. 706 (N.D.Ill. 1982); Christian v. Tackett, 86 F.R.D. 220 (N.D. Miss. 1979); Gillam v. A. Shyman, Inc., 31 F.R.D. 271 (D. Alaska 1962).
220. Dr. Bernard Heller Foundation v. Lee, 847 F.2d 83 (3rd Cir. 1988); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998). See, also, Louisiana Power and Light Co. v. Kellstrom, 50 F.3d 319 (5th Cir. 1995); McGuigan v. CAE Link Corp., 155 F.R.D. 31 (NDNY 1994).
221. Kansas v. Colorado, 129 S.Ct. 1294 (2009); Crawford Fitting Company v. I. T. Gibbons, Inc., 482 U.S. 437 (1987); In re Philadelphia Mortgage Trust, 930 F.2d 306 (3rd Cir. 1990); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3rd Cir. 1988); Dr. Bernard Heller Foundation v. Lee, 847 F.2d 83 (3rd Cir. 1988); Dominic v. Hess Oil V.I. Corp., 841 F.2d 513 (3rd Cir. 1988).
222. Crawford Fitting Company v. I. T. Gibbons, Inc., 482 U.S. 437 (1987); In re Philadelphia Mortgage Trust, 930 F.2d 306 (3rd Cir. 1990); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3rd Cir. 1988); Dr. Bernard Heller Foundation v. Lee, 847 F.2d 83 (3rd Cir. 1988); Dominic v. Hess Oil V.I. Corp., 841 F.2d 513 (3rd Cir. 1988).
223. Sierra Club v. EPA, 769 F.2d 796 (DC Cir. 1985); In Re: Air Crash Disaster at John F. Kennedy International Airport on June 24, 1975, 687 F.2d 626 (2nd Cir. 1982); Griffith v. Mt. Carmel Medical Center, 157 F.R.D. 499 (D. Kansas 1994); Radol v. Thomas, 113 F.R.D. 172 (SD Ohio 1986); Marquez v. American Export Lines, 41 F.R.D. 386 (SDNY 1967).
224. Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998). See, also, Bee v. Greaves, 910 F.2d 686 (10th Cir. 1990); Jensen v. Lawler, 338 F.Supp. 2d 739 (SD Texas 2004); Heverly v. Lewis, 99 F.R.D. 135, 136 (D.Nev. 1983); Gillam v. Shyman, Inc., 31 F.R.D. 271 (D. Alaska 1962).

225. Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998). See also, Griffith v. Mt. Carmel Medical Center, 157 F.R.D. 499 (D. Kansas 1994); Todd Shipyards Corp. v. Turbine Services, Inc., 592 F.Supp. 380 (E.D. La. 1984); Morrison v. Alleluia Cushion Co., 73 F.R.D. 70, 71 (N.D. Miss. 1976); Sperry Rand Corp. v. A-T-O Co., 58 F.R.D. 132 (E.D. Va. 1973).
226. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
227. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265, 268 (1988)(emphasis added). Accord, Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). See also, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
228. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). Accord, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
229. Brazos Valley Coalition for Life, Inc. v. City of Bryan, Texas, 421 F.3d 314 (5th Cir. 2005); Trepel v. Roadway Express, Inc., 266 F.3d 418 (6th Cir. 2001); Holmes v. Cessna Aircraft Co., 11 F.3d 63 (5th Cir. 1994); Dovenmuehle v. Gildorn Mortgage Midwest Corp., 871 F.2d 697 (7th Cir. 1989); Mason v. Belieu, 543 F.2d 215 (D.C. Cir. 1976); Wahl v. Carrier Manufacturing Co., 511 F.2d 209 (7th Cir. 1975); McInnis v. Town of Weston, 458 F.Supp.2d 7 (D. Conn. 2006); Sullivan v. Cheshier, 991 F.Supp. 999 (N.D. Ill. 1998); Hollenbeck v. Falstaff Brewing Corp., 605 F.Supp. 421 (E.D. Mo. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 980 (E.D. Mo. 1983).
230. In Re: Kulicke & Soffa Industries Inc. Securities Litigation, 747 F.Supp. 1136 (E.D.Pa. 1990), *aff'd*, 944 F.2d 897 (3rd Cir. 1991); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); Nugget Distributors Cooperative of America v. Mr. Nugget, Inc., 145 F.R.D. 54 (E.D.Pa. 1992). Accord, Charter Medical Corp v. Cardin, 127 FRD 111 (D. Maryland 1989); Women's Federal Savings and Loan Association of Cleveland v. Nevada National Bank, 108 FRD 396 (D. Nevada 1985); International Wood Processors v. Power Dry, Inc., 598 F. Supp. 299 (D.S.C. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 178 (ED Mo. 1983).
231. Kansas v. Colorado, 129 S.Ct. 1294 (2009).
232. Crawford Fitting Company v. J. T. Gibbons, Inc., 482 U.S. 437 (1987); Henkel v. Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis and Omaha Railroad Company, 284 U.S. 444 (1932).
233. Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Raio v. American Airlines, 102 F.R.D. 608 (E.D. Pa. 1984). See also, Women's Federal Savings and Loan Association of Cleveland v. Nevada National Bank, 108 F.R.D. 396 (D. Nevada 1985).
234. Central Delaware Branch of the NAACP v. City of Dover, Delaware, 123 FRD 85 (D. Delaware 1988).

235. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3d Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
236. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265, 268 (1988)(emphasis added). Accord, Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). See, also, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3d Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
237. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). Accord, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3d Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
238. Brazos Valley Coalition for Life, Inc. v. City of Bryan, Texas, 421 F.3d 314 (5th Cir. 2005); Trepel v. Roadway Express, Inc., 266 F.3d 418 (6th Cir. 2001); Holmes v. Cessna Aircraft Co., 11 F.3d 63 (5th Cir. 1994); Dovenmuehle v. Gildorn Mortgage Midwest Corp., 871 F.2d 697 (7th Cir. 1989); Mason v. Belieu, 543 F.2d 215 (D.C. Cir. 1976); Wahl v. Carrier Manufacturing Co., 511 F.2d 209 (7th Cir. 1975); McInnis v. Town of Weston, 458 F.Supp.2d 7 (D. Conn. 2006); Sullivan v. Cheshier, 991 F.Supp. 999 (N.D. Ill. 1998); Hollenbeck v. Falstaff Brewing Corp., 605 F.Supp. 421 (E.D. Mo. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 980 (E.D. Mo. 1983).
239. In Re: Kulicke & Soffa Industries Inc. Securities Litigation, 747 F.Supp. 1136 (E.D.Pa. 1990), aff'd, 944 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1991); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); Nugget Distributors Cooperative of America v. Mr. Nugget, Inc., 145 F.R.D. 54 (E.D.Pa. 1992). Accord, Charter Medical Corp v. Cardin, 127 F.R.D. 111 (D. Maryland 1989); Women's Federal Savings and Loan Association of Cleveland v. Nevada National Bank, 108 F.R.D. 396 (D. Nevada 1985); International Wood Processors v. Power Dry, Inc., 598 F. Supp. 299 (D.S.C. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 178 (ED Mo. 1983).
240. Kansas v. Colorado, 129 S.Ct. 1294 (2009).
241. Crawford Fitting Company v. J. T. Gibbons, Inc., 482 U.S. 437 (1987); Henkel v. Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis and Omaha Railroad Company, 284 U.S. 444 (1932).
242. Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Raio v. American Airlines, 102 F.R.D. 608 (E.D. Pa. 1984). See, also, Women's Federal Savings and Loan Association of Cleveland v. Nevada National Bank, 108 F.R.D. 396 (D. Nevada 1985).
243. Central Delaware Branch of the NAACP v. City of Dover, Delaware, 123 FRD 85 (D. Delaware 1988).

244. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
245. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265, 268 (1988)(emphasis added). Accord, Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). See, also, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
246. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). Accord, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
247. Brazos Valley Coalition for Life, Inc. v. City of Bryan, Texas, 421 F.3d 314 (5th Cir. 2005); Trepel v. Roadway Express, Inc., 266 F.3d 418 (6th Cir. 2001); Holmes v. Cessna Aircraft Co., 11 F.3d 63 (5th Cir. 1994); Dovenmuehle v. Gildorn Mortgage Midwest Corp., 871 F.2d 697 (7th Cir. 1989); Mason v. Belieu, 543 F.2d 215 (D.C. Cir. 1976); Wahl v. Carrier Manufacturing Co., 511 F.2d 209 (7th Cir. 1975); McInnis v. Town of Weston, 458 F.Supp.2d 7 (D. Conn. 2006); Sullivan v. Cheshier, 991 F.Supp. 999 (N.D. Ill. 1998); Hollenbeck v. Falstaff Brewing Corp., 605 F.Supp. 421 (E.D. Mo. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 980 (E.D. Mo. 1983).
248. In Re: Kulicke & Soffa Industries Inc. Securities Litigation, 747 F.Supp. 1136 (E.D.Pa. 1990), aff'd, 944 F.2d 897 (3rd Cir. 1991); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); Nugget Distributors Cooperative of America v. Mr. Nugget, Inc., 145 F.R.D. 54 (E.D.Pa. 1992). Accord, Charter Medical Corp v. Cardin, 127 FRD 111 (D. Maryland 1989); Women's Federal Savings and Loan Association of Cleveland v. Nevada National Bank, 108 FRD 396 (D. Nevada 1985); International Wood Processors v. Power Dry, Inc., 598 F. Supp. 299 (D.S.C. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 178 (ED Mo. 1983).
249. Smith v. Tenet Healthsystems SL, Inc., 436 F.3d 879 (8th Cir. 2006).
250. Helms v. WalMart Stores, Inc., 808 F.Supp. 1568 (ND Ga. 1992), aff'd 998 F.2d 1023 (11th Cir. 1993); Haagen-Dazs Co. v. Rainbow Gourmet Ice Creams, Inc., 920 F.2d 587 (9th Cir. 1990); Rodriguez-Garcia v. Davila, 904 F.2d 90 (1st Cir. 1990); Allen v. United States Steel Corp., 665 F.2d 689 (5th Cir. 1982); McGuigan v. CAE Link Corp., 155 FRD 31 (NDNY 1994); Nelson v. Darragh Co., 120 FRD 517 (WD Ark. 1988); Meadows v. Ford Motor Co., 62 FRD 98 (WD Ky. 1973); Gillam v. A. Shyman, Inc., 31 FRD 271 (D. Alaska 1962).
251. Montgomery County v. Microvote Corp., 2004 WL 1087196 (EDPA 2004); McGuigan v. CAE Link Corp., 155 FRD 31 (NDNY 1994).
252. Race Tires America, Inc. v. Hoosier Racing Tire Corp., 674 F.3d 158 (3d Cir. 2012).

253. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
254. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265, 268 (1988)(emphasis added). Accord, Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). See, also, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
255. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). Accord, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
256. Brazos Valley Coalition for Life, Inc. v. City of Bryan, Texas, 421 F.3d 314 (5th Cir. 2005); Trepel v. Roadway Express, Inc., 266 F.3d 418 (6th Cir. 2001); Holmes v. Cessna Aircraft Co., 11 F.3d 63 (5th Cir. 1994); Dovenmuehle v. Gildorn Mortgage Midwest Corp., 871 F.2d 697 (7th Cir. 1989); Mason v. Belieu, 543 F.2d 215 (D.C. Cir. 1976); Wahl v. Carrier Manufacturing Co., 511 F.2d 209 (7th Cir. 1975); McInnis v. Town of Weston, 458 F.Supp.2d 7 (D. Conn. 2006); Sullivan v. Cheshier, 991 F.Supp. 999 (N.D. Ill. 1998); Hollenbeck v. Falstaff Brewing Corp., 605 F.Supp. 421 (E.D. Mo. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 980 (E.D. Mo. 1983).
257. In Re: Kulicke & Soffa Industries Inc. Securities Litigation, 747 F.Supp. 1136 (E.D.Pa. 1990), aff'd, 944 F.2d 897 (3rd Cir. 1991); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); Nugget Distributors Cooperative of America v. Mr. Nugget, Inc., 145 F.R.D. 54 (E.D.Pa. 1992). Accord, Charter Medical Corp v. Cardin, 127 F.R.D. 111 (D. Maryland 1989); Women's Federal Savings and Loan Association of Cleveland v. Nevada National Bank, 108 F.R.D. 396 (D. Nevada 1985); International Wood Processors v. Power Dry, Inc., 598 F. Supp. 299 (D.S.C. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 178 (ED Mo. 1983).
258. Johnson v. Holway, 522 F.Supp. 2d 12 (DDC 2007).
259. Johnson v. Holway, 522 F.Supp. 2d 12 (DDC 2007).
260. Johnson v. Holway, 522 F.Supp. 2d 12 (DDC 2007).
261. Haroco, Inc. v. American National Bank and Trust Company of Chicago, 38 F.3d 1429 (7th Cir. 1994); Johnson v. Holway, 522 F.Supp. 2d 12 (DDC 2007).
262. Accord, Soler v. McHenry, 771 F.Supp. 252 (ND Ill. 1991), aff'd, 989 F.2d 251 (7th Cir. 1993); Maxwell v. Hapag-Lloyd Aktiengesellschaft, 862 F.2d 767 (9th Cir. 1988); Nissho-Iwai Co. v. Occidental Crude Sales, Ltd., 729 F.2d 1530 (5th Cir. 1984); DiBella v. Hopkins, 407 F.Supp. 2d 537 (SDNY 2005); Jensen v. Lawler, 338 F.Supp. 2d 739 (SD Texas 2004); United Intern. Holdings, Inc. v. Wharf (Holdings) Ltd., 174 FRD 479 (D. Colo. 1997); Phillips v. Cameron Tool Corp., 131 F.R.D. 151 (SD Ind. 1990).

263. Soler v. McHenry, 771 F.Supp. 252 (ND Ill. 1991), aff'd, 989 F.2d 251 (7th Cir. 1993); Maxwell v. Hapag-Lloyd Aktiengesellschaft, 862 F.2d 767 (9th Cir. 1988); In Re: Air Crash Disaster at John F. Kennedy International Airport on June 24, 1975, 687 F.2d 626 (2nd Cir. 1982); Jensen v. Lawler, 338 F.Supp. 2d 739 (SD Texas 2004); United Intern. Holdings, Inc. v. Wharf (Holdings) Ltd., 174 FRD 479 (D. Colo. 1997).
264. Jensen v. Lawler, 338 F.Supp. 2d 739 (SD Texas 2004).
265. In Re: Air Crash Disaster at John F. Kennedy International Airport on June 24, 1975, 687 F.2d 626 (2nd Cir. 1982).
266. Soler v. McHenry, 771 F.Supp. 252 (ND Ill. 1991); aff'd, 989 F.2d 251 (7th Cir. 1993); Nissho-Iwai Co. v. Occidental Crude Sales, Ltd., 729 F.2d 1530 (5th Cir. 1984); DiBella v. Hopkins, 407 F.Supp. 2d 537 (SDNY 2005); Jensen v. Lawler, 338 F.Supp. 2d 739 (SD Texas 2004).
267. In Re: Air Crash Disaster at John F. Kennedy International Airport on June 24, 1975, 687 F.2d 626 (2nd Cir. 1982); DiBella v. Hopkins, 407 F.Supp.2d 537 (SDNY 2005); United Intern. Holdings, Inc. v. Wharf (Holdings) Ltd., 174 F.R.D. 479 (D. Colo. 1997).
268. Phillips v. Cameron Tool Corp., 131 F.R.D. 151 (SD Ind. 1990).
269. DiBella v. Hopkins, 407 F.Supp.2d 537 (SDNY 2005).
270. Sierra Club v. EPA, 769 F.2d 796 (DC Cir. 1985); In Re: Air Crash Disaster at John F. Kennedy International Airport on June 24, 1975, 687 F.2d 626 (2nd Cir. 1982); Griffith v. Mt. Carmel Medical Center, 157 F.R.D. 499 (D. Kansas 1994); Radol v. Thomas, 113 F.R.D. 172 (SD Ohio 1986); Marquez v. American Export Lines, 41 F.R.D. 386 (SDNY 1967).
271. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstine v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
272. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265, 268 (1988)(emphasis added). Accord, Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). See also, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstine v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
273. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). Accord, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstine v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).

274. Brazos Valley Coalition for Life, Inc. v. City of Bryan, Texas, 421 F.3d 314 (5th Cir. 2005); Trepel v. Roadway Express, Inc., 266 F.3d 418 (6th Cir. 2001); Holmes v. Cessna Aircraft Co., 11 F.3d 63 (5th Cir. 1994); Dovenmuehle v. Gildorn Mortgage Midwest Corp., 871 F.2d 697 (7th Cir. 1989); Mason v. Belieu, 543 F.2d 215 (D.C. Cir. 1976); Wahl v. Carrier Manufacturing Co., 511 F.2d 209 (7th Cir. 1975); McInnis v. Town of Weston, 458 F.Supp.2d 7 (D. Conn. 2006); Sullivan v. Cheshier, 991 F.Supp. 999 (N.D. Ill. 1998); Hollenbeck v. Falstaff Brewing Corp., 605 F.Supp. 421 (E.D. Mo. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 980 (E.D. Mo. 1983).
275. In Re: Kulicke & Soffa Industries Inc. Securities Litigation, 747 F.Supp. 1136 (E.D.Pa. 1990), *aff'd*, 944 F.2d 897 (3rd Cir. 1991); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3rd Cir. 1975); Nugget Distributors Cooperative of America v. Mr. Nugget, Inc., 145 F.R.D. 54 (E.D.Pa. 1992). *Accord*, Charter Medical Corp v. Cardin, 127 FRD 111 (D. Maryland 1989); Women's Federal Savings and Loan Association of Cleveland v. Nevada National Bank, 108 FRD 396 (D. Nevada 1985); International Wood Processors v. Power Dry, Inc., 598 F. Supp. 299 (D.S.C. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 178 (ED Mo. 1983).
276. Johnson v. Holway, 522 F.Supp. 2d 12 (DDC 2007).
277. Johnson v. Holway, 522 F.Supp. 2d 12 (DDC 2007).
278. Johnson v. Holway, 522 F.Supp. 2d 12 (DDC 2007).
279. Haroco, Inc. v. American National Bank and Trust Company of Chicago, 38 F.3d 1429 (7th Cir. 1994); Johnson v. Holway, 522 F.Supp. 2d 12 (DDC 2007).
280. Winniczek v. Nagelberg, 400 F.3d 503 (7th Cir. 2005).
281. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3rd Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3rd Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3rd Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3rd Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3rd Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3rd Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3rd Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3rd Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3rd Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
282. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265, 268 (1988)(emphasis added). *Accord*, Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). *See also*, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3rd Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3rd Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3rd Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3rd Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3rd Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3rd Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3rd Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3rd Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3rd Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
283. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). *Accord*, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3rd Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3rd Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3rd Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3rd Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3rd Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3rd Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3rd Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3rd Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3rd Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
284. Brazos Valley Coalition for Life, Inc. v. City of Bryan, Texas, 421 F.3d 314 (5th Cir. 2005); Trepel v. Roadway Express, Inc., 266 F.3d 418 (6th Cir. 2001); Holmes v. Cessna Aircraft Co., 11 F.3d 63 (5th Cir. 1994); Dovenmuehle v. Gildorn Mortgage Midwest Corp., 871 F.2d 697 (7th Cir. 1989); Mason v. Belieu, 543 F.2d 215 (D.C. Cir. 1976); Wahl v. Carrier Manufacturing Co., 511 F.2d 209 (7th Cir. 1975); McInnis v. Town of Weston, 458 F.Supp.2d 7 (D. Conn. 2006); Sullivan v. Cheshier, 991 F.Supp. 999 (N.D. Ill. 1998); Hollenbeck v. Falstaff Brewing Corp., 605 F.Supp. 421 (E.D. Mo. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 980 (E.D. Mo. 1983).

285. In Re: Kulicke & Soffa Industries Inc. Securities Litigation, 747 F.Supp. 1136 (E.D.Pa. 1990), *aff'd*, 944 F.2d 897 (3rd Cir. 1991); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); Nugget Distributors Cooperative of America v. Mr. Nugget, Inc., 145 F.R.D. 54 (E.D.Pa. 1992). *Accord*, Charter Medical Corp v. Cardin, 127 FRD 111 (D. Maryland 1989); Women's Federal Savings and Loan Association of Cleveland v. Nevada National Bank, 108 F.R.D. 396 (D. Nevada 1985); International Wood Processors v. Power Dry, Inc., 598 F. Supp. 299 (D.S.C. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 178 (ED Mo. 1983).
286. Sierra Club v. EPA, 769 F.2d 796 (DC Cir. 1985); In Re: Air Crash Disaster at John F. Kennedy International Airport on June 24, 1975, 687 F.2d 626 (2nd Cir. 1982); Griffith v. Mt. Carmel Medical Center, 157 F.R.D. 499 (D. Kansas 1994); Radol v. Thomas, 113 F.R.D. 172 (SD Ohio 1986); Marquez v. American Export Lines, 41 F.R.D. 386 (SDNY 1967).
287. In Re: Air Crash Disaster at John F. Kennedy International Airport on June 24, 1975, 687 F.2d 626 (2nd Cir. 1982).
288. Jensen v. Lawler, 338 F.Supp. 2d 739 (SD Texas 2004).
289. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
290. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265, 268 (1988)(emphasis added). *Accord*, Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). *See also*, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
291. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). *Accord*, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
292. Brazos Valley Coalition for Life, Inc. v. City of Bryan, Texas, 421 F.3d 314 (5th Cir. 2005); Trepel v. Roadway Express, Inc., 266 F.3d 418 (6th Cir. 2001); Holmes v. Cessna Aircraft Co., 11 F.3d 63 (5th Cir. 1994); Dovenmuehle v. Gildorn Mortgage Midwest Corp., 871 F.2d 697 (7th Cir. 1989); Mason v. Belieu, 543 F.2d 215 (D.C. Cir. 1976); Wahl v. Carrier Manufacturing Co., 511 F.2d 209 (7th Cir. 1975); McInnis v. Town of Weston, 458 F.Supp.2d 7 (D. Conn. 2006); Sullivan v. Cheshier, 991 F.Supp. 999 (N.D. Ill. 1998); Hollenbeck v. Falstaff Brewing Corp., 605 F.Supp. 421 (E.D. Mo. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 980 (E.D. Mo. 1983).
293. In Re: Kulicke & Soffa Industries Inc. Securities Litigation, 747 F.Supp. 1136 (E.D.Pa. 1990), *aff'd*, 944 F.2d 897 (3rd Cir. 1991); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); Nugget Distributors Cooperative of America v. Mr. Nugget, Inc., 145 F.R.D. 54 (E.D.Pa. 1992). *Accord*, Charter Medical Corp v. Cardin, 127 FRD 111 (D. Maryland 1989); Women's Federal Savings and Loan Association of Cleveland v. Nevada National Bank, 108 F.R.D. 396 (D. Nevada 1985); International Wood Processors v. Power Dry, Inc., 598 F. Supp. 299 (D.S.C. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 178 (ED Mo. 1983).

294. Taniguchi v. Kan Pacific Saipan, Ltd., 132 S.Ct. 1997 (2012).
295. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
296. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265, 268 (1988)(emphasis added). Accord, Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). See also, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
297. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981). Accord, Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995); Smith v. SEPTA, 47 F.3d 97 (3d Cir. 1995); Friedman v. Ganassi, 853 F.2d 207 (3d Cir. 1988); Institutionalized Juveniles v. Secretary of Public Welfare, 758 F.2d 897 (3d Cir. 1985); Pearlstone v. United States, 649 F.2d 194 (3rd Cir. 1981); Delaney v. Capone, 642 F.2d 57 (3d Cir. 1981); Samuel v. University of Pittsburgh, 538 F.2d 991 (3d Cir. 1976); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); City of Rome, Italy v. Glanton, 184 F.R.D. 547 (E.D. Pa. 1999); Greene v. Fraternal Order of Police, 183 F.R.D. 445 (E.D. Pa. 1998); Action Alliance for Senior Citizens of Greater Philadelphia v. Shapp, 74 F.R.D. 617 (E.D. Pa. 1977).
298. Brazos Valley Coalition for Life, Inc. v. City of Bryan, Texas, 421 F.3d 314 (5th Cir. 2005); Trepel v. Roadway Express, Inc., 266 F.3d 418 (6th Cir. 2001); Holmes v. Cessna Aircraft Co., 11 F.3d 63 (5th Cir. 1994); Dovenmuehle v. Gildorn Mortgage Midwest Corp., 871 F.2d 697 (7th Cir. 1989); Mason v. Belieu, 543 F.2d 215 (D.C. Cir. 1976); Wahl v. Carrier Manufacturing Co., 511 F.2d 209 (7th Cir. 1975); McInnis v. Town of Weston, 458 F.Supp.2d 7 (D. Conn. 2006); Sullivan v. Cheshire, 991 F.Supp. 999 (N.D. Ill. 1998); Hollenbeck v. Falstaff Brewing Corp., 605 F.Supp. 421 (E.D. Mo. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 980 (E.D. Mo. 1983).
299. In Re: Kulicke & Soffa Industries Inc. Securities Litigation, 747 F.Supp. 1136 (E.D.Pa. 1990), aff'd, 944 F.2d 897 (3rd Cir. 1991); ADM Corp. v. Speedmaster Packing Corp., 525 F.2d 662 (3d Cir. 1975); Nugget Distributors Cooperative of America v. Mr. Nugget, Inc., 145 F.R.D. 54 (E.D.Pa. 1992). Accord, Charter Medical Corp v. Cardin, 127 FRD 111 (D. Maryland 1989); Women's Federal Savings and Loan Association of Cleveland v. Nevada National Bank, 108 FRD 396 (D. Nevada 1985); International Wood Processors v. Power Dry, Inc., 598 F. Supp. 299 (D.S.C. 1984); Morrissey v. County Tower Corp., 568 F.Supp. 178 (ED Mo. 1983).
300. Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995).
301. Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981).
302. Sea Coast Foods, Inc. v. Lu-Mar Lobster & Shrimp, 260 F.3d 1054 (9th Cir. 2001).
303. Sea Coast Foods, Inc. v. Lu-Mar Lobster & Shrimp, 260 F.3d 1054 (9th Cir. 2001).
304. Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August, 450 U.S. 346 (1981).
305. Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995).

306. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Alyeska Pipeline Service Co. v. Wilderness Society, 421 U.S. 240 (1975); Fleischmann Distilling Co. v. Maier Brewing Co., 386 U.S. 714 (1967); Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); In re: Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation, 221 F.3d 449 (3d Cir. 2000); Adams v. Teamsters Local 115, 678 F.Supp.2d 314 (E.D. Pa. 2007).
307. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); McKenna v. City of Philadelphia, 582 F.3d 447 (3d Cir. 2009).
308. Buchanan v. Stanships, Inc., 485 U.S. 265 (1988); Reger v. The Nemours Foundation, 599 F.3d 285 (3d Cir. 2010); McKenna v. City of Philadelphia, 582 F.3d 447 (3d Cir. 2009).
309. SNA, Inc. v. Array, 173 F.Supp.2d 347 (E.D.Pa. 2001). Accord, L-3 Communications Corp. v. OSI Systems, Inc., 607 F.3d 24, 30 (2d Cir. 2010); Republic Tobacco Co. v. North Atlantic Trading Co., 481 F.3d 442 (7th Cir. 2007); Emmenegger v. Bull Moose Tube Co., 324 F.3d 616 (8th Cir. 2003); Berthelsen v. Kane, 907 F.2d 617 (6th Cir. 1990); Choice Hotels International, Inc. v. Kaushik, 203 F.Supp.2d 1281 (M.D. Ala. 2002).
310. Republic Tobacco Co. v. North Atlantic Trading Co., 481 F.3d 442 (7th Cir. 2007).
311. Republic Tobacco Co. v. North Atlantic Trading Co., 481 F.3d 442, 448 (7th Cir. 2007)(emphasis added).
312. Republic Tobacco Co. v. North Atlantic Trading Co., 481 F.3d 442 (7th Cir. 2007).
313. Republic Tobacco Co. v. North Atlantic Trading Co., 481 F.3d 442 (7th Cir. 2007).
314. Republic Tobacco Co. v. North Atlantic Trading Co., 481 F.3d 442, 448 (7th Cir. 2007)(emphasis added).
315. Advisory Committee Notes on the 1967 adoption of Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 39(e).
316. L-3 Communications Corp. v. OSI Systems, Inc., 607 F.3d 24 (2d Cir. 2010).
317. L-3 Communications Corp. v. OSI Systems, Inc., 607 F.3d 24 (2d Cir. 2010).
318. Republic Tobacco Co. v. North Atlantic Trading Co., 481 F.3d 442 (7th Cir. 2007).
319. Casey v. Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania, 14 F.3d 848 (3rd Cir. 1994).
320. Briggs v. Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 334 U.S. 304 (1948). Although it is over sixty years old, the United States Supreme Court's decision in Briggs has never been reversed and remains vital law to this date. Accord, Casey v. Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania, 14 F.3d 848 (3rd Cir. 1994).
321. Pease v. Rathbun-Jones Engineering Co., 243 U.S. 273 (1917).
322. Abrams v. Lightolier, Inc., 50 F.3d 1204 (3d Cir. 1995).
323. Casey v. Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania, 14 F.3d 848 (3rd Cir. 1994).
324. Briggs v. Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 334 U.S. 304 (1948). Although it is over sixty years old, the United States Supreme Court's decision in Briggs has never been reversed and remains vital law to this date. Accord, Casey v. Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania, 14 F.3d 848 (3rd Cir. 1994).
325. Pease v. Rathbun-Jones Engineering Co., 243 U.S. 273 (1917).

COURTROOM DEPUTY CLERKS

Each judge is assigned a courtroom deputy clerk who is responsible for scheduling and monitoring cases on the judge's calendar. The courtroom deputy clerk acts as a liaison between the judge and counsel, scheduling dates and times for hearings or motions, pretrial hearings and trials, and conferring with attorneys on any special trial procedures.

A. New Case Procedures

The Eastern District of Pennsylvania operates on an individual calendar system, as opposed to a master calendar system, which means that the assigned judge is responsible for all cases assigned, from filing to disposition.

After a case is filed, the courtroom deputy clerk checks the docket for timely service of process and the filing of an answer. If service has not been made within 90 days, a letter will be sent by the courtroom deputy clerk asking that service be made by the 120th day. If service has been made, but the complaint has not been answered, again a letter will be sent by the courtroom deputy requesting counsel to motion for judgment by default. Please do not ignore these notices. If you do, it could result in dismissal of the case for lack of prosecution. [See Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(a)].

Counsel may receive a status request form by contacting the courtroom deputy to the judge to whom the case is assigned. This form contains questions relating to the scheduling of the case, such as, length of time needed for discovery and estimated length of time for trial.

B. Pretrial Practices

After a complaint is filed, service has been made, and an answer is filed, an order is prepared which sets forth a discovery schedule. The order will specify a date by which all discovery must be completed and schedules a final pretrial conference, generally four to six weeks after the discovery deadline. Usually the case is put in the civil pool for trial in one month. However, not all judges follow the same pretrial practices. If you have questions, call the courtroom deputy clerk of the judge to whom the case is assigned, or check the court's website at <http://www.paed.uscourts.gov> for judges' policies and procedures.

C. Scheduling Cases

When discovery has been completed and pretrial conferences have been held, there are three ways in which a case can be scheduled for trial:

1. **Civil Trial Pool** – Most judges have the majority of cases in this pool.

2. **Date Certain** – This is a target date set weeks or months in advance and depends on the judge’s calendar and availability of attorneys for the date to be met.
3. **Special Listing** – An agreement exists between the District Court judges and the State Court judges in the nine county area of Bucks, Chester, Delaware, Montgomery, Philadelphia, Berks, Lancaster, Lehigh and Northampton. (**Appendix S**).

These special listings take precedence over all other trial engagements provided the following requirements are met:

- the listing is established 30 days in advance by notice to counsel involved and all active judges;
- all district court judges and the judges in the 9-county area are notified at least 30 days in advance of counsel involved and of probable duration of trial:
- that not more than one such special listing shall be granted by the same judge to one lawyer in a six-month period, except for good cause.

The notice which is sent to district court judges and to court administrators in other courts must contain the name of the case, the date the case is scheduled, name of counsel, and the approximate amount of time required for trial.

D. Trial List

Each judge maintains a trial list of cases generally ready for trial. The federal trial list is published in the Legal Intelligencer from Monday through Friday. Below is a sample listing:

J. Curtis Joyner, C.J.
Courtroom 17A
Deputy Clerk: Sharon Carter
Phone: 267-299-7419

Mon., March 5, 2007

On Trial

Civil Jury Trial

10:00 a.m.

2006-8995 J. Smith

Becker v. ABC Company

M. Doe; J.P. Stewart

Trial Pool

2005-7213 p.p.

Jones v. Friedman

D. Wood

The following notice is published each day in the Legal Intelligencer and explains the policy of the Judges of the United States District Court for listing cases in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

1. Counsel shall promptly notify the deputy clerk to each judge before whom he/she has a case listed upon becoming attached for trial in another court. To be accorded recognition, a busy slip, using the designated form, ***MUST*** be filed in Room 2609 before 1:00 p.m. on the day after counsel becomes attached.
2. Cases in the trial pools do not necessarily appear in the order in which they will be called. Counsel should therefore be ready to begin trial upon receiving telephone call notice, subject to the following:
 - (a) Counsel whose cases are in the pools will be given 48 hours' notice, if feasible, but not less than 24 hours' notice to be ready for trial with witnesses.
 - (b) It is counsel's responsibility to check with each judge's deputy clerk on the status and movement of criminal and civil cases in that judge's pool.
 - (c) Counsel will not be required to commence trial less than 24 hours after completing trial of another case.

E. Judicial Schedule of Trials – Automated System Inquiry (JUST-ASK)

The Judicial Schedule of Trials – Automated System Inquiry (**JUST-ASK**) system provides up-to-date information on the status of trials scheduled in the United States District Court seven days a week, twenty-four hours a day. **JUST-ASK** is offered free of charge and is accessible to any individual office with a PC and internet access.

Events, such as verdicts, settlements, and continuances constantly change the status of cases on the Court's trial list. **JUST-ASK** immediately reflects the daily status of listings as the information becomes available to the Clerk of Court.

All cases scheduled for trial, presently on trial, in the trial pool and special notices from the Court are included on the system. **JUST-ASK** also provides the capability of viewing a report on the disposition of cases previously listed on the system. For user convenience, all information contained in this system is available by judge, date, case number, party name and/or attorney name. The user may choose the option which is most convenient to view listings. For example, **JUST-ASK** allows the user to retrieve a list of cases in which a specified attorney is involved, then the information can be printed at the user's computer. If you have any questions on scheduling, please contact the courtroom deputy.

The **JUST-ASK** system can be accessed through the District Court's website at <http://www.paed.uscourts.gov>.

F. Lobby Kiosk Information System

An automated informational kiosk system, located in the U.S. Courthouse lobby, includes current information on district court and court of appeals hearings, as well as a directory of judges and court clerks, location of other government agencies and general information. The kiosk provides touch screen technology, as well as mapping techniques to guide visitors to their destinations.

G. Busy Slips

It is important that busy slips (*Appendix T*) be filed promptly so that cases can be properly scheduled. Busy slips can be obtained at the front counter of the Clerk's Office, Room 2609, and should be filed in the Clerk's Office by 1:00 p.m. the day after counsel becomes attached. If a conflict arises before a particular judge, priority is given to the oldest case by date of filing. Please advise the courtroom deputy when the attorney is again available, or if the case was settled.

H. Attachments for Trial

Attorneys can only be attached three business days prior to a date of trial and can only be held for attachment for three business days.

I. Continuances – Criminal Cases

The Speedy Trial Act requires that defendants be brought to trial within a 70-day period after indictment or initial appearance before a judicial officer. This 70-day period can be extended only by a judge for specific reasons set forth in the Speedy Trial Act Plan which is on file and available for inspection in the Clerk's Office.

J. Motions

When filing a motion, please include a proposed order for the judge's signature. Since courtroom deputies are responsible for tracking motions, it is important that a certificate of service be attached to the motion so that they can calculate the date a response is due. If the parties have reached an agreement, notify us by stipulation. If a motion has been filed and the parties have settled their dispute, let the courtroom deputy know as soon as possible.

K. Exhibits

At the completion of trial, either the courtroom deputy clerk will keep exhibits or the Court will have counsel maintain custody until all appeals are exhausted or the appeal time has expired. If the courtroom deputy clerk has custody, the exhibits will be returned to counsel. If the exhibits are too large or too bulky to mail, the courtroom deputy will send a letter to the attorney requesting that the exhibits be picked up. If the exhibits are not picked up, they will be deemed abandoned and will then be destroyed (see Local Civil Rule 39).

L. Other Duties

Some additional duties performed by courtroom deputy clerks are:

- noting the appearance of counsel in matters before the court;
- impaneling the jury and administering oaths to jurors; providing liaison with the jury clerk as to ordering and canceling or juries; and keeping required records on other jury matters;
- administering oaths to witnesses, interpreters, attorneys on admission, and oaths of allegiance to applicants for citizenship;
- recording proceedings and rulings for minutes of the court; filing, marking, storing, and returning exhibits; and composing minute orders to carry out expressed intention of the judge;
- preparing verdict forms and judgments;

- advising the financial section of the Clerk's Office on matters affecting that section, particularly the imposition of fines and orders or restitution by the judge in criminal cases.

The following charts list the courtroom deputy clerks according to their assigned judge, along with their telephone numbers.

DISTRICT COURT JUDGES	COURTROOM DEPUTY	PHONE NUMBER
Petrese B. Tucker, Chief Judge	Michael Owens	267-299-7619
Legrome D. Davis	Donna Croce	267-299-7659
Cynthia M. Rufe	Velma White (Civil) Erica Pratt (Criminal)	267-299-7491 267-299-7499
Timothy J. Savage	Harry Grace	267-299-7489
James Knoll Gardner	Cheryl Sinclair (Civil) Jennifer Fitzko (Criminal)	610-434-3457 610-391-7019
Gene E.K. Pratter	Michael Coyle	267-299-7359
Lawrence F. Stengel	Patricia Cardella (Civil) Laura Buenzle (Criminal)	267-299-7761 267-299-7769
Paul S. Diamond	Marion Scarengelli	267-299-7739
Juan R. Sanchez	Nancy DeLisle	267-299-7789
Joel H. Slomsky	Margaret Gallagher	267-299-7349
C. Darnell Jones II	A'ishah El-Shabazz	267-299-7759
Mitchell S. Goldberg	Steve Sonnie	267-299-7509
Nitza I. Quiñones Alejandro	Carey Doris Widman (Civil) Rosalind Burton-Hoop (Criminal)	267-299-7461 267-299-7467
L. Felipe Restrepo	Maryellen Fox (Civil) Juanita Davis (Criminal)	267-299-7741 267-299-7691
Jeffrey L. Schmehl	Barbara A. Crossley	267-299-7560 610-320-5099

SENIOR JUDGES	COURTROOM DEPUTY	PHONE NUMBER
J. William Ditter, Jr.	Stephen Iannacone	267-299-7211
Norma L. Shapiro	Madeline Ward	267-299-7549
Thomas N. O'Neill, Jr.	Charles Ervin	267-299-7559
Edmund V. Ludwig	Kathryne Crispell	267-299-7589
Robert F. Kelly	Mark Rafferty	267-299-7319
Jan E. DuBois	Milahn Hull	267-299-7339
Ronald L. Buckwalter	Matthew Higgins	267-299-7369
William H. Yohn, Jr.	Thomas McCann	267-299-7379
Harvey Bartle III	Kristin Makely	267-299-7389
Stewart Dalzell	Eileen Adler	267-299-7399
John R. Padova	Geraldine Keane (Civil) Michael Beck (Criminal)	215-597-1178 267-299-7409
J. Curtis Joyner	Sharon Carter	267-299-7419
Eduardo C. Robreno	Ronald Vance	267-299-7429
Anita B. Brody	James Scheidt	267-299-7439
Berle M. Schiller	Jean Pennie (Civil) Christopher Campoli (Criminal)	267-299-7621 267-299-7629
Mary A. McLaughlin	Dennis Hartman	267-299-7609
R. Barclay Surrick	Donna Marley (Civil) Christina Franzese (Criminal)	267-299-7631 267-299-7639
Michael M. Baylson	JoAnne Bryson (Civil) Janice Lutz (Criminal)	267-299-7571 267-299-7291

MAGISTRATE JUDGES	COURTROOM DEPUTY	PHONE NUMBER
Carol Sandra Moore Wells, Chief Magistrate Judge	Edward Andrews	215-597-7833
Thomas J. Rueter	Lisa Tipping	215-597-0048
Linda K. Caracappa	Ian Broderick	267-299-7640
Timothy R. Rice	Chavela Settles	267-299-7660
David R. Strawbridge	Lorraine DiSanti	267-299-7790
Henry S. Perkin	Helen Nicholas	610-434-3823
Elizabeth T. Hey	Lara Karlson	267-299-7670
Lynne A. Sitarski	Regina Zarnowski	267-299-7810
M. Faith Angell	Shelli MacElderry	215-597-6079
Jacob P. Hart	Deborah Stevenson	215-597-2733

STANDING ORDER RE: SENTENCING REFORM ACT OF 1984

In accordance with the resolution approved by the Judges of this Court on January 19, 1988, a standing order (*Appendix U*) was adopted for use in criminal cases in which sentences are imposed under the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984 (Chapter II of the Comprehensive Crime Control Act, Public Law No. 98473, 98 Stat. 1837, 1976 (enacted October 12, 1984)).

AFTER-HOURS CONTACT FOR EMERGENCY MATTERS

A deputy clerk is on duty in the Clerk's Office each week day from 8:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. Attorneys who wish to contact the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania during the evenings after 5:30 p.m. or on weekends may do so by calling (215) 597-0374 or toll-free at (800) 525-5726 or (877) 437-7411. These numbers connect with the Court Security Office and Federal Protective Service which is staffed 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Attorneys who call these numbers will be referred to the Clerk or a deputy clerk on duty. This service is available for attorneys who have to file an injunction, ship attachment, or other emergency business during non-business hours.

AFTER-HOURS FILING DEPOSITORY

An After-Hours Filing Depository is provided in the lobby of the courthouse past the metal detectors and is able to receive documents for filing after 5:00 p.m. A time recorder is affixed to the depository which enables the person submitting documents for filing to note the time and date the documents are placed in the depository. If the documents are submitted after the doors are locked, access to the building may be gained by activating the buzzer adjacent to the main entrance on Market Street.

OPINION / CORRESPONDENCE CLERK

Margaret Stipa and Matthew Cocci are responsible for answering general correspondence inquiries. Margaret can be reached at (267) 299-7047; Matthew can be reached at (267) 299-7094.

We maintain civil case files for calendar years 2009 to the present year and criminal case files from 2009 to the present, in addition to all open cases, in the Clerk's Office. Files for previous years are stored at the Federal Records Center. Send a letter to the attention of the correspondence clerks specifying the case number of the file you need and the documents in which you are interested. They will obtain the file and send you a copy of the papers that you need at a cost of 50¢ per page. There is an additional fee of \$11 for a certified copy. The cost of retrieving a file from the Federal Records Center is \$53.

Any inquiries to search the index for case numbers, judgment, decrees, etc., will be handled by the correspondence clerks. The fee is \$30 per name searched.

Judicial opinions filed in the Eastern District since June 1, 1997, as well as opinions filed in Civil Action Number 96-963, A.C.L.U., et al. v. Janet Reno, Attorney General of the U.S., in Civil Action Number 96-1458, American Library, et al. v. U.S. Department of Justice, in Civil Action Number 96-2486, Cyber Promotions, Inc. v. American Online, Inc., and in Civil Action Number 96-5213, America Online, Inc. v. Cyber Promotions, Inc., may be obtained through the opinion section on the Eastern District of Pennsylvania's Internet website at <http://www.paed.uscourts.gov>.

HOW TO FIND A CASE NUMBER

Cases are indexed using the microfiche system, public access computers and **PACER** (see section on **PACER**). At the computers located in the Clerk's Office, you will find printed explanations on the procedure to locate a case number in order to find the docket sheet for that case. Every microfiche index is labeled with the filing time frames for each category. Information on cases filed prior to the specified time frames may be obtained from the Records Room.

CLERK'S INDEX FILE BY NATURE OF SUIT

The Clerk's Office makes this service available at no cost. It is an Index to Civil Actions by Subject prior to March 21, 1994, and is arranged under these main topics: Persons, Property, Contracts, Torts & Other Statutes. Subject headings are exactly the same as those specified on the Civil Cover Sheet.

Refer to the Table of Contents under the appropriate main heading and find the page number on which reference is made to civil actions on the desired subject. Copy down the case number(s) shown and draw the case file jackets or docket sheets to see if the cases listed are helpful.

COPY WORK

Adjacent to Room 2609 is the Reproduction Room. To have copies made, you must complete a request form and prepay the cost, either in person or by mail.

It is possible to obtain copy work the same day. However, it depends on the quantity of work and the time constraints of the photocopy operator.

RECORDS ROOM

Adjacent to the Reproduction Room is the Records Room where all open case files for civil and criminal cases are maintained. In addition to all open case files, all civil files from 2009 to the present year, and all criminal cases from 2009 to the present year, are located in the file room. Individual files and papers may be inspected in this area by the general public. Files are available from the Federal Records Center through our office. There is a \$53 fee for this service. If you have questions, you may contact the records room at (267) 299-7082.

CREDIT CARD COLLECTION NETWORK

In September of 1987, the Department of Treasury established a government credit card collection network to enable federal agencies to accept credit cards (Visa, MasterCard, American Express, Discovery and Diners Club) for the collection of receipts due the government.

Credit cards are accepted as payment at the counter for the following transactions in the Clerk's office:

- filing fees;
- copy work (docket sheets, opinions, etc.);

- copies of ESR-taped proceedings;
- attorney admission fees;
- searches and certifications;
- retrieval fees for case files maintained at the Federal Records Center.

For counter transactions, submit the charge card for recording, validating, and imprinting onto a bank charge slip. The amount of the charge, transaction code, date and time appear on the bank charge slip and cash register receipt. The original cash register receipt and bank charge slip are given to the customer, and the copies are kept on file in the Clerk's Office.

For those law firms that are concerned with the safekeeping of the actual credit card, the Clerk's Office will maintain the firm's credit card number, expiration date and signature of one of the firm's partners after completion of an authorization form (**Appendix V**). The courier will reference the authorization form and the transaction will be processed. On the bank charge slip, "**AUTHORIZATION ON FILE**" would appear in the signature block.

Credit Cards are ***not*** accepted as payment for mail or telephone requests.

REQUIRED CHECK CONVERSION DISCLOSURE

When you provide a check as payment, you authorize us either to use information from your check to make a one-time electronic fund transfer from your account or to process the payment as a check transaction. When we use information from your check to make an electronic fund transfer, funds may be withdrawn from your account as soon as the same day we receive your payment, and you will not receive your check back from your financial institution. For inquiries, please call (267) 299-7107.

If the electronic fund transfer cannot be completed because there are insufficient funds in your account, we may impose a one-time fee of \$53.00 against your account, which we will also collect by electronic fund transfer.

A Privacy Act Statement required by 5 U.S.C. § 552a(e)(3) stating our authority for soliciting and collecting the information from your check, and explaining the purposes and routine uses which will be made of your check information, is available from our internet site at www.paed.uscourts.gov or by calling toll free at (866) 945-7920 to obtain a copy by mail. Furnishing the check information is voluntary, but a decision not to do so may require you to make payment by some other method.

DEPOSITING / WITHDRAWING MONIES

The Fiscal Department is responsible for coordinating all financial transactions involving the district court. All court-related fees are paid and disbursements are made through this department. In order to deposit or withdraw monies from the registry, you

must submit a proposed order. Please call Lucy Chin, the Financial Manager at (267) 299-7112 with any questions on this procedure.

A. Deposits

All checks should be made payable to "***Clerk, U.S. District Court.***" This is the only form of check that will be accepted. It is recommended that all deposits made into the registry of the court for subsequent disbursement be accomplished by a treasurer's check or a certified check in order to allow for prompt disbursement.

B. Registry Fund, Deposit Fund, Interest-Bearing Accounts

Disbursements are made from the registry fund upon order of the court only. The case docket is reviewed to determine if disbursement is appropriate, then the financial ledger sheet is pulled from the registry binder and compared with the court order. A voucher is prepared by the financial deputy and a check is drawn and mailed to the payee.

As a result of a new appropriation authority approved by the Judicial Conference, a fee in the amount of 10% of the annual interest has been established to cover the costs to the Judiciary for handling registry funds placed in interest-bearing accounts. The fee shall apply to all money and property held in the Court's registry and invested in interest-bearing accounts, except unclaimed monies held in accounts for individuals or persons whose whereabouts are unknown. Assessment of this fee will commence on all case payments (withdrawals) from the registry of the Court made on or after December 1, 1988. However, fees will be assessed only for the holding of funds after September 30, 1988. As to previously existing accounts, September 30 will be considered the original date of deposit with respect to the starting case balance and the number of days held. The fee will be computed at the time of withdrawal from the date of receipt into the registry through the date of withdrawal based on the average daily balance in the account. Payment of the fee will be deducted from the balance on deposit at the time of distribution.

Disbursements from the deposit fund, i.e., court-appointed counsel fees, are accomplished by preparing a voucher and forwarding it to the certifying officer. When the certified voucher is returned, a check is drawn on the voucher and mailed to the payee.

Upon order of the court, an interest-bearing account is closed with the local bank and deposited into the registry fund as a bank transfer. A U.S. Treasury check is drawn and handled the same as a registry disbursement.

FINES

Fine payments received through the mail are checked for the case number. If the individual is on probation, the receipt for payment is processed and sent to the Probation Office to credit the proper account. If the individual is not on probation, the payment is checked against the Case Master File to assure the proper amount is received without an overpayment. Overpayment is discouraged and the Probation Office is made aware of overpayment and asked to have the correct amount resubmitted. When it is impossible to have the check reissued for the correct amount, the overpayment is deposited into the Deposit Fund and disbursed at a later time to the probationer.

After the payments are verified as correct, a receipt is issued. The money is deposited into the U.S. Treasury (General and Special Fund) and postal fines are deposited into the deposit fund and disbursed quarterly. The original receipts are forwarded to the Probation Office.

Fines to be paid in person are sent to the Fiscal Department, where the Fine Case Account is checked. The financial deputy fills out a form indicating the case caption and number, the account number (FUND), and the amount to be paid. The form is given to the individual, who is sent to the cashier for issuance of a receipt.

Fines received from the Probation Office are hand-delivered by probation personnel. If the fine is a first payment, a letter is attached stating the defendant's name, case number, and the amount to be paid. The criminal or magistrate docket is checked to obtain the total amount and a new account is set up on the automated financial system.

If there was a prior payment, the Probation Office attaches a card with the payment, indicating the case number.

CENTRAL VIOLATIONS BUREAU (CVB)

In the district courts, the CVB provides a case management system for petty offenses (and some misdemeanors) which originate with the filing of a violation notice sent by the issuing government agency directly to the CVB. If collateral is forfeited to the CVB within the specified time, the date and amount is entered and the case is closed. In cases which are not disposed of through forfeiture of collateral, the CVB schedules a hearing before a Magistrate Judge, notifies the defendant, and records the Magistrate Judge's disposition of the case.

BAIL BONDS

Bail is generally set by the court from one of the following categories:

1. **Own Recognizance** – In this instance, the defendant signs an Appearance Bond in the amount fixed by the court without posting any security.
2. **In an Amount Equal to 10% of the Total Amount of the Bond** – In this instance, the defendant or someone on their behalf deposits 10% of the amount of the bond. If it is the defendant's cash, only the defendant signs the appearance bond. If it is the surety's cash, then both must sign. Local Civil Rule 67.1(a) states that "no attorney, or officer of this court shall be acceptable as surety bail, or security of any kind in any proceeding in this court."
3. **In an Amount with Good Security** – In this instance, both the defendant and the surety must sign the appearance bond with acceptable security being posted. Security may be one of the following:
 - **Cash** – only cash, certified or cashier's check, or money order are acceptable;
 - **Corporate Surety** – with power of attorney;
 - **Individual Sureties – Real Estate** – explained on sample form "Bail Bond Secured by Property or Real Estate Bail" (*Appendix W*);
 - **Securities** – only negotiable securities are acceptable.

ATTORNEY ADMISSIONS

Applications for admission to the bar of our court for those attorneys who are currently members in good standing of the bar of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania pursuant to Local Rule of Civil Procedure 83.5(a) may be obtained at the front counter of the Clerk's Office. Admission ceremonies are held once a week. The fee for attorney admission is \$201.00. There is an \$18.00 fee for a duplicate certificate of admission or certificate of good standing. For further information on attorney admissions, call Aida Ayala, the attorney admissions clerk at (267) 299-7099.

Pursuant to Local Rule of Civil Procedure 83.5(b), attorneys who are not currently admitted to either the bar of this court or the bar of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania shall not actively participate in the conduct of any trial or pre-trial or post-trial proceeding before this court unless, upon motion of a member of the bar of this court containing a

verified application, leave to do so is granted (*Appendix X*). A \$40 fee is assessed for such admissions.

COURT REPORTING / RECORDING SERVICES

Orders for transcripts produced by court reporters can be accomplished through the Court Reporter Supervisor, Joan Carr at (267) 299-7104, by means of a Transcript Order Form (*Appendix Y*).

Orders for transcripts produced by electronic sound recording can be accomplished through the Transcript Coordinator, David Hayes at (267) 299-7041, by means of a Transcript Order Form (*Appendix Y*). Orders for tapes or CDs produced by ESR can be accomplished by means of the Tape Order Form (*Appendix Z*).

ELECTRONIC TRANSCRIPTS OF COURT PROCEEDINGS

With the exception of sealed transcripts which are excluded from electronic filing, effective June 2, 2008, electronic transcripts of court proceedings in the United States District Court, Eastern District of Pennsylvania, will be made available to the public as follows:

- Transcripts of civil court proceedings will be placed on CM/ECF or PACER with the approval of the presiding judge.
- Transcripts of criminal court proceedings will not be placed on CM/ECF or PACER unless approved by the presiding judge.

If electronic transcripts are to be made available to the public upon approval of the assigned judge:

- A transcript provided to the court reporter or transcriber will be available at the office of the Clerk for inspection for a period of 90 days after it is delivered to the Clerk.
- During the 90-day period a copy of the transcript may also be obtained by purchase from the court reporter or transcriber through the office of the Clerk. An attorney who obtains the transcript from the office of the Clerk will be allowed remote access to the transcript through the court's CM/ECF system.
- After the 90-day period has expired, the filed transcript will be available for inspection and copying in the Clerk's office. With the approval of the presiding judge, the transcript may also be

available for download from the court's CM/ECF system through the PACER system.

In addition, amendments to the Federal Civil and Criminal Rules of Procedure (Civil Rule 5.2 and Criminal Rule 49.1) require that personal identification information be redacted from documents filed with the court, including Social Security numbers, names of minor children, financial account numbers, dates of birth, and in criminal cases, home addresses.

For more information on electronic transcripts, please contact Joan Carr, Supervisor of Court Reporters, at (267) 299-7104 or Michael Hearn, Electronic Sound Recording Coordinator, at (267) 299-7039. (See **Appendix AA**).

DIGITAL AUDIO FILE ELECTRONIC ACCESS

Digital audio recordings of courtroom proceedings will be publicly available on PACER upon the approval of the presiding judge. The project enables PACER users to download, in MP3 format, court proceedings that have been recorded using electronic sound recording technology. (See **Appendix BB**).

For more information, contact Michael Hearn, Electronic Sound Recording Coordinator, at (267) 299-7039.

VIDEO RECORDING SERVICES

The Clerk's Office has video recording facilities for the taking of depositions of witnesses. These services are provided at the discretion of the assigned judge. To request video recording of witnesses, contact Edward Morrissy at (267) 299-7044. There is no charge for the use of the video recording service, but counsel is required to supply the necessary dvds.

Counsel is required to give notice to the opposing party as to their intention to utilize the video recording procedure.

VIDEO TELECONFERENCING

On June 1, 1995, the Eastern District of Pennsylvania started a video teleconferencing pilot program sponsored by the United States Marshal Service and the Federal Bureau of Prisons. This program establishes a closed-circuit television link between the United States District Court in Philadelphia and the Federal Correctional Institute at Fairton, New Jersey. In May 1988, this program was expanded to include links between the District Court and State Correctional Institutions, including Graterford, Greene and Camp Hill. The program allows criminal defendants incarcerated at these institutions to fully participate in court appearances, interviews and conferences. The equipment and

facilities are also available to the Office of Pretrial Services, the United States Probation Office, the Federal Defender, the United States Attorney, and the defense bar when not in use by the Court. All requests to use the VTC equipment for conferences are to be submitted to the VTC Coordinator, who can be reached at (267) 299-7039.

The VTC Program has not been limited to only cases in which defendants are incarcerated. For visiting judge cases in which judges of this court sit by designation in Middle or Western District Court cases, this program has been successfully utilized to conduct conferences between this court and counsel from outside districts which are similarly equipped with VTC equipment. For further information on this service, please contact the VTC coordinator.

COURTROOM TECHNOLOGY

Several courtrooms provide an array of technical components that support evidence presentation, remote site interactions, language interpreting and audio enhancement. The state-of-the-art technologies include assisted listening systems, integrated court interpreting systems, video teleconferencing systems, document/video presentation systems, evidence trolleys, annotation pads, document cameras, as well as connectivity at counsel tables for use with court-or-attorney-provided PCs. The court welcomes the bar to make use of these technologies and training is available at the courthouse. For further information, contact Michael Hearn at (267) 299-7039 or Edward Morrissy at (267) 299-7044.

INTERPRETERS' SERVICES

Effective September 1, 1997, the Clerk's Office became responsible for scheduling interpreters for all criminal proceedings and for all civil cases initiated by the Government. The interpreter coordinator, Larry Bowman, (267) 299-7029, will schedule all interpreters required for court appearances.

Once the need for an interpreter has been established, the courtroom deputy to the assigned judge will be responsible for notifying the interpreter coordinator of all court proceedings requiring the use of an interpreter.

JURY SELECTION

The jury section is responsible for selecting and maintaining a pool of citizens qualified to serve as grand and petit jurors in this district and summoning these individuals for jury service. Jurors are selected pursuant to the *Plan of the Random Selection of Grand and Petit Jurors of 1968 for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania*. A copy of this plan is available for inspection in the Office of the Clerk of Court. The jury section is also responsible for preparation of vouchers and documentation required to reimburse jurors for their service.

A. Term of Jury Service

In our district, jurors are called for either a two-day/one trial term of service each Monday or a three-day/one trial term of service on Wednesdays. If selected for a case where the trial extends beyond one week, jurors are required to serve until the completion of the trial.

B. Excuse from Jury Service on Request

In addition to members of groups and occupational classes subject to excuse from jury service pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1863(b)(5) and (7), any person summoned for jury service may, on request, be excused temporarily by a judge of this court. The person must show undue hardship or extreme inconvenience by reason of great distance, either in miles or travel time, from the place of holding court, grave illness in the family or any other emergency which outweighs in urgency the obligation to serve as a juror when summoned, or any other factor which the court determines to constitute an undue hardship or to create an extreme inconvenience to the juror. Additionally, in situations where it is anticipated that a trial or grand jury proceeding may require more than thirty days of service, the court may consider, as a further basis for temporary excuse, severe economic hardship to an employer which would result from the absence of a key employee during the period of such service.

The period for which such prospective jurors may be excused shall be the period of time which the judge deems necessary under the circumstances, which shall be fixed in the order granting the excuse. At the expiration of the period so fixed, such persons shall be summoned again for jury service within a reasonable time.

C. Payment

Jurors receive \$40 for each day in attendance, plus .565 cents per mile (eff. 1/15/2013) as measured from their residence to the courthouse (roundtrip). The court calculates the computation of this fee. If a juror lives more than 50 miles from the courthouse and remains overnight, the juror will be reimbursed for room and living expenses. Subsistence allowance is \$209 per night (from 9/1 through 11/30) and \$203 per night (from 12/1 through 8/31) in Philadelphia, \$142 per night in Reading, and \$134 per night in Allentown or Easton. If you have any questions regarding jury matters, you may call (267) 299-7299.

INCLEMENT WEATHER

In the event of inclement or otherwise extreme weather conditions, the public is urged to call the court's Coda-A-Phone line for a special announcement on whether the courthouse will be closed or if trials have been cancelled for that day. A recorded message on the toll-free number (1-800) 829-0189 will be accessible from about 5:30 a.m. Attorneys and jurors are requested to call this number before leaving their office or residence to attend court. It is also suggested that the public tune into radio and television news stations, which will also broadcast announcements if jury trials have been adjourned or if the courthouse will be closed for that day. If no announcement is made by 6:00 a.m. and there is no special message on the recording, it should be assumed that court will be in session and jurors are to report for jury duty as scheduled.

PACER – PUBLIC ACCESS TO COURT ELECTRONIC RECORDS

The **PACER** system provides improved access to court records for attorneys and other members of the public. This electronic access system allows any member of the public to access information contained in the court's civil/criminal docket database via internet access. The user is able to access a search of information either through a case name or a case number and can request docket reports. The information is either saved on the user's PC or the report is printed during online access.

All civil cases filed since July 1, 1990 and all criminal cases filed since July, 1992 are contained on the **PACER** system. In addition, the **PACER** system will allow an end-user to check recent activity. If there has been no recent activity, the **PACER** system will confirm that fact in seconds.

The **PACER** system is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Electronic case filings and updates to the docket are available for immediate view.

The Eastern District of Pennsylvania's **PACER** system is administered by the **PACER** Service Center. The center provides all support services as well as billing services for **PACER** access.

Many Eastern District of Pennsylvania **PACER** users are already registered with the **PACER** Service Center for access to the **PACER** systems throughout the federal court system. If you are currently registered with the **PACER** Service Center, please call the center at (1-800) 676-6856 to add the Eastern District of Pennsylvania to your account.

If you are not registered with the center, complete a **PACER** registration form (*Appendix CC*) available on the court's website at <http://www.paed.uscourts.gov> and forward it to the **PACER** Service Center, P.O. Box 780549, San Antonio, TX 78278-0549, or fax it to: (201) 301-6441, or a completed application may be submitted via e-mail. The address for **PACER** is <http://www.pacer.gov>. Users may access **PACER** by using their **PACER** login and password. The fee for accessing **PACER** is 10¢ per page.

Should you have any questions concerning **PACER** service or registration, please contact the center at (1-800) 676-6856.

INTERNET WEBSITE

Information on multiple services and all judicial opinions filed since June 1, 1997 in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, as well as e-mail capabilities are available on the internet at <http://www.paed.uscourts.gov>. The site contains the following:

- Judicial opinions filed since June 1, 1997, including a *Recent Opinions* section;
- E-mail capabilities with the Office of the Clerk of Court;
- Directory of automated services (*Appendix DD*);
- Local civil, criminal and Bankruptcy rules;
- Court notices;
- Electronic Case Filing;
- Forms;
- Report of cases specially listed for U.S. District Court and surrounding county courts;
- Multidistrict litigation information;
- Criminal documents;
- Frequently asked questions;

- Clerk's Office Procedural Handbook containing information on: filing civil actions / documents, general motion practice and pretrial procedures, fees, judicial chambers information (phone numbers, addresses, staff), forms (appendices), Clerk's Office directory, appeals, bill of costs and after hours filing;
- Telephone directory and address information;
- Judicial Schedule of Trials – Automated System Inquiry (JUST-ASK);
- Search capabilities;
- Link to **PACER**;
- Judicial policies and procedures;
- Juror information;
- Federal holidays; and
- Arbitrator and mediator applications.

LOCAL RULES

The local rules of court-civil, criminal, admiralty and bankruptcy are available from the Clerk's office and also on the internet at <http://www.paed.uscourts.gov>. Inquiries should be directed to Aida Ayala at (267) 299-7099, in room 2625.

PORTABLE ELECTRONIC DEVICES AND PUBLIC TELEPHONES

Visitors to the U.S. Courthouse are permitted to carry portable electronic devices, such as cell phones and laptops into the courthouse, but all equipment will be subject to x-ray and visual inspection by the Court Security Officers at the security screening station. All equipment must be turned off before entering courtrooms and chambers, unless otherwise authorized by the presiding judge. Failure to follow this restriction may result in sanctions by the judge.

While cell phones are permitted in the courthouse, there are also numerous pay telephones available for use by the public located on every floor of the building, except on the 21st and 22nd floors. A directory of public telephone locations and numbers follows:

DIRECTORY OF PUBLIC TELEPHONE LOCATIONS

**U.S. COURTHOUSE
PHILADELPHIA, PA**

FLOOR	TELEPHONE NUMBER	LOCATION OF TELEPHONE
Lobby	215-922-8886	Hallway adjacent to public elevators
Lobby	215-922-8668	Hallway adjacent to public elevators
Lobby	215-922-8673	Hallway adjacent to public elevators
Lobby	215-922-8683	Hallway adjacent to public elevators
Lobby	215-922-8682	Hallway adjacent to public elevators
Lobby	215-922-8671	Hallway adjacent to public elevators
3rd Floor	215-922-8690	Hallway adjacent to secured corridor
4th Floor	215-922-8797	Hallway adjacent to secured corridor
4th Floor	215-922-8796	Hallway adjacent to secured corridor
5th Floor	215-922-8798	Hallway adjacent to secured corridor
7th Floor	215-922-8870	Hallway adjacent to secured corridor
7th Floor	215-922-8864	Hallway adjacent to secured corridor
8th Floor	215-922-8874	Hallway adjacent to secured corridor
8th Floor	215-922-8873	Hallway adjacent to secured corridor
15th Floor	215-922-9437	Hallway adjacent to secured corridor
16th Floor	215-922-9459	Hallway adjacent to secured corridor
20th Floor	215-922-9551	Hallway adjacent to secured corridor

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA
CLERK'S OFFICE EMPLOYEE LIST

INFORMATION DESK – Chris Kurek (215) 597-7704

CLERK OF COURT

Michael E. Kunz	215-597-9221
Miriam Coco, Secretary	267-299-7085
Lauren Moran	267-299-7086

**CASE REASSIGNMENTS/
TAXATION OF COSTS**

Susan Renz	267-299-7218
------------	--------------

STAFF ATTORNEY

Ken Wilson	267-299-7088
Kevin Dunleavy	267-299-7087

HUMAN RESOURCES**Human Resources Administrator**

Donna L. Diaz	267-299-7089
---------------	--------------

Human Resources Coordinator

Deana Drobonick	267-299-7091
-----------------	--------------

Personnel Specialists

Jamie L. Wilson	267-299-7092
Diane Michalik	267-299-7242

MDL 875 LAW CLERK

Christopher Lucca	267-299-7422
-------------------	--------------

CHIEF DEPUTY

Susan Matlack	267-299-7051
---------------	--------------

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES MANAGER

Michael Sienkiewicz	267-299-7030
---------------------	--------------

ELECTRONIC SOUND RECORDING**COORDINATOR**

Michael Hearn	267-299-7039
---------------	--------------

TRANSCRIPTION COORDINATOR

David Hayes	267-299-7041
-------------	--------------

ESR OPERATORS

James Beck	267-299-7196
Jimmy Cruz	267-299-7224
Michael DelRossi	267-299-7219
Inna Goldshteyn	267-299-7222
Patrick Kelly	267-299-7236
Jerry LaRosa	267-299-7129
Jeffrey Lucini	267-299-7214
Andrea Mack	267-299-7179
Nelson Malave	267-299-7213
Joseph Matkowski	267-299-7220
Dennis Taylor	267-299-7121
Crystal Wardlaw	267-299-7212
Jessica Whitfield	267-299-7161

COURTROOM TECHNOLOGY COORDINATOR

Michael Hearn	267-299-7039
Edward Morrissy	267-299-7044

COURTROOM DEPUTY SUPERVISORS

Donna Bozzelli	267-299-7539
Stephen Iannacone	267-299-7211

COURTROOM DEPUTY CLERKS

Eileen Adler - SD	267-299-7399
Rosalind Burton-Hoop - NIQA	267-299-7467
Sharon Carter - JCJ	267-299-7419
Kathryne Crispell - EL	267-299-7589
Juanita Davis - LFR	267-299-7691
Nancy DeLisle - JRS	267-299-7789

COURTROOM DEPUTY CLERKS

Harry Grace - TJS	267-299-7489
Dennis Hartman - MAM	267-299-7609
Milahn V. Hull - JED	267-299-7069
Kristin Makely - HB	267-299-7389
Michael Owens - PBT	267-299-7619
Elizabeth Purnell	267-299-7579
Ronald Vance - ER	267-299-7429
Madeline Ward - NS	267-299-7549

COURTROOM DEPUTY CLERKS/ESR OPERATORS

Michael Beck - JRP	267-299-7409
Laura Buenzle - LFS	267-299-7769
Christopher Campoli - BMS	267-299-7629
Michael Coyle - GEKP	267-299-7359
Donna Croce - LDD	267-299-7659
A`iShah El-Shabazz - DJ	267-299-7759
Charles Ervin - TON	267-299-7559
Jennifer Fitzko - JKG	610-391-7019
Connie Flores	267-299-7191
Christina Franzese - RBS	267-299-7639
Margaret Gallagher - JHS	267-299-7349
Matthew Higgins - RB	267-299-7369
Teri Lefkowitz - JLS	610-320-5030
Janice Lutz - MMB	267-299-7291
Adrienne Mann	267-299-7289
Thomas McCann - WY	267-299-7379
Erica Pratt - CMR	267-299-7499
Mark Rafferty - RK	267-299-7319
Marion Scarengelli - PD	267-299-7739
James Scheidt - AB	267-299-7439
Steve Sonnie - MG	267-299-7509
Anthony Tumminello	610-252-7548
Andrew Follmer	267-299-7226
Lenora Kashner Wittje	267-299-7529

SECRETARY/COURTROOM DEPUTY CLERKS

Lisa Brady	267-299-7158
Patricia Feldman	267-299-7441
Sharon Hall	267-299-7591
Sheila Jeffers	267-299-7169
Judy Mack	610-320-5006
Carol Sampson	267-299-7174
Marcie Silfies	610-320-9821

MAGISTRATE JUDGES DEPUTY CLERKS

Edward Andrews - CSMW	267-299-7771
Ian Broderick - LKC	267-299-7641
Lorraine DiSanti - DRS	267-299-7790
Lara Karlson - ETH	267-299-7670
Shelli MacElderry - MFA	215-597-6079
Helen Nicholas - HSP	610-391-7025
Chavela Settles - TRR	267-299-7660
Deborah Stevenson - JPH	267-299-7721
Lisa Tipping - TJR	267-299-7701
Regina M. Zarnowski - LAS	267-299-7810

OPINION/CORRESPONDENCE CLERKS

Matt Cocci	267-299-7094
Margaret Stipa	267-299-7047

JURY ADMINISTRATOR

Paul Lombardi	267-299-7078
---------------	--------------

JURY SELECTION

Main Number	267-299-7299
-------------	--------------

JURY SELECTION

Elizabeth Cleek	267-299-7049
Jean Conboy	267-299-7050
Carolanne Goss	267-299-7077
Jo-Anne Hohenstein	267-299-7076
Marilou Masters	267-299-7079
AnnaMarie Prudente	267-299-7081
Shelia Ward	267-299-7080

ARCHIVAL SPECIALIST

Frederick Druding, Jr.	267-299-7046
------------------------	--------------

RECORDS ROOM SUPERVISOR

Michael Finney	267-299-7084
----------------	--------------

FILE/MAIL METERING CLERKS

Ken Campbell	267-299-7082/83
Steven Carey	267-299-7082/83
Carl J. Hauger	267-299-7082/83
Michael P. Sweeney	267-299-7082/83

XEROX OPERATOR

Kenneth E. Duvak	267-299-7082/83
------------------	-----------------

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES SUPERVISOR

Michael Hutelmyer	267-299-7095
-------------------	--------------

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES CLERKS**Telecommunications Specialist**

John Szymanski	267-299-7186
James Finegan	267-299-7097
Richard Struble	267-299-7100

Technical Support Specialist

Gregg Keller	267-299-7194
--------------	--------------

Property & Procurement Specialist

Trevor McDermott	267-299-7096
------------------	--------------

Property Officer

Charles Parkinson	267-299-7144
-------------------	--------------

Procurement Specialists

Casey Fretz - Supplies	267-299-7142
Lori Stutz	267-299-7098
Raymond Wolf	267-299-7223
Brian Weissman	267-299-7215

Procurement Assistants

Donna Bakker 267-299-7171
Jordan Todd 267-299-7170

NATURALIZATION/ATTORNEY ADMISSIONS

Aida Ayala 267-299-7099

INTERPRETER COORDINATOR

Larry Bowman 267-299-7029

AUTOMATION TRAINER

William Jones 267-299-7063

CASE OPENING/DOCUMENT SCANNING CLERKS

Christopher Ehly 267-299-7245
Brian Johnson 267-299-7277
Patrick McLaughlin 267-299-7146

FISCAL**Financial Manager**

Lucy Chin 267-299-7112

Financial Officer

Joseph Hall 267-299-7107

Financial Supervisor

Maria Andrews 267-299-7108

Voucher/Disbursements

Terryl Richardson 267-299-7109

CJA Vouchers

Peter Mordeczko 267-299-7110

Financial Assistant

Zachary Robinson 267-299-7111

Receivable Checks

Michael O'Reilly 267-299-7131

Kelly Stratton 267-299-7113

BUDGET ANALYST

Joseph Hall 267-299-7107

DOCUMENT SCANNING CLERK

Liana Lui 267-299-7243

Greg Williams 267-299-7244

AUTOMATION SUPPORT 267-299-7240

SYSTEMS MANAGER

Mark Boraske 267-299-7052

ASSISTANT SYSTEMS MANAGER

Dan De Cerchio 267-299-7055

SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATORS

Raymond Gilchrist 267-299-7057

Sean O'Connor 267-299-7056

ANALYST

Mary Grace O'Connor 267-299-7066

SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY ADMINISTRATORS

Daniel Baback 267-299-7153

Dan DeLuca 267-299-7054

AUTOMATION SUPPORT TECHNICIANS

Bryant Jones 267-299-7172

Omar Lee 267-299-7154

Dawn Molony 267-299-7247

Jon Montovani 267-299-7053

ALLENTOWN OFFICE**AUTOMATION SUPPORT TECHNICIAN**

Craig R. Kroznuski 610-776-6117

AUTOMATION SUPPORT SPECIALIST

James McGovern 267-299-7059

DATA QUALITY ANALYSTS

Gail Olson 267-299-7060

Karen Vample 267-299-7061

SYSTEMS ANALYST PROGRAMMER

Ronald Sochanski 267-299-7065

STATISTICAL ANALYST

Stanislaw Furtek 267-299-7058

May Kim 267-299-7143

Kyle John Noll 267-299-7064

Suzy Roman 267-299-7020

STATISTICAL CLERK

Britney Butler 267-299-7234

OPERATIONS MANAGER

Richard Sabol 267-299-7011

ASSISTANT OPERATIONS MANAGER

Theresa Milano 267-299-7013

CASE PROCESSING SUPERVISOR

Jane Firestone 267-299-7014

CASE PROCESSING QUALITY CONTROL CLERK

Michele DiNapoli 267-299-7147

PRISONER DOCKET CLERKS

1-3 Fernando Benitez 267-299-7025

4-6 Linda Jerry 267-299-7026

7-9 Jim Deitz 267-299-7022

1-0 Peggy Rosser 267-299-7062

MDL/CASE PROCESSING CLERK

Thomas Dempsey 267-299-7018

CASE PROCESSING/DOCUMENT SCANNING CLERK

Vincent Alia 267-299-7238
 Alex Eggert 267-299-7216
 Jenna Marie Gallelli 267-299-7248
 Ulie Hevener 267-299-7296
 Nicole Phillippi 267-299-7288
 Eric Sobieski 267-299-7241

MDL/CASE PROCESSING COORDINATOR

Linda Jerry 267-299-7026

ASSIGNMENT CLERK

Gregg Swierczynski 267-299-7230

CASE PROCESSING SUPERVISOR

Nicole D'Urso 267-299-7017

CASE PROCESSING CLERKS

#1 Robert D. Fehrle 267-299-7001
 #2 Kirk Kopacz 267-299-7002
 #3 Kristen Pepin 267-299-7003
 #4 Tashia Reynolds 267-299-7004
 #5 Kimberly Williams 267-299-7005
 #6 Michele Helmer 267-299-7006
 #7 Joseph Lavin 267-299-7007
 #8 Ashley Mastrangelo 267-299-7008
 #9 Steve Gill 267-299-7009
 #10 Frank DelCampo 267-299-7010
 # 1-10 Jenniffer Cabrera 267-299-7227

CASE PROCESSING CLERKS

1-10 Lisa DeAngelo Lamb 267-299-7043
 # 1-10 Amanda Frazier 267-299-7177
 # 1-10 Ann Murphy 267-299-7068
 # 1-10 Danielle Puchon 267-299-7048

CASE OPENING/ARBITRATION and MEDIATION SUPERVISOR

Sherry Bowman 267-299-7067

CASE OPENING/ARBITRATION CLERKS

#1-2 Michael Mani 267-299-7071
 #3-4 Patricia Jones 267-299-7072
 #5-6 Joseph Walton 267-299-7073
 #7-8 Janet M. Vecchione 267-299-7074
 #9-0 Kimberly Scott-Hayden 267-299-7075
 #0-9 Richard Thieme 267-299-7285

MEDIATION CLERK

Sherry Bowman 267-299-7067

CASE OPENING/DOCUMENT SCANNING CLERKS

Shawn A. Cammy 267-299-7282
 Michael Cosgrove 267-299-7284
 Katie Furphy 267-299-7286
 Kelly Ann Haggerty 267-299-7283
 Christian Henry 267-299-7193
 Nelly Lu 267-299-7195
 Peter O'Driscoll 267-299-7173
 Heather Stolinski 267-299-7159
 Justin Wood 267-299-7280

CASE PROCESSING SUPERVISOR

Kevin Eibel 267-299-7035

SPEEDY TRIAL COORDINATOR / QUALITY CONTROL CLERK

Carlos Cardona 267-299-7023

CRIMINAL DOCKETING CLERKS

#1-3 Angela Burge 267-299-7160
 #4-6 Tom Giambrone 267-299-7024
 #7-9 Kevin Eibel 267-299-7035
 #0 Mark Ciamaichelo 267-299-7145

GRAND JURY CLERK

Eileen Bobb 267-299-7016

APPEALS CASE PROCESSING CLERK

Orlando Medina, Jr. 267-299-7015

ASSIGNMENT CLERK

Steve B. Tomas 267-299-7028

MAGISTRATE DOCKETING CLERK

Mark Ciamaichelo 267-299-7145

PRO SE WRIT CLERK

Daniel McCormack 267-299-7021

CASE PROCESSING/DOCUMENT SCANNING CLERK

John Arrow 267-299-7235

ALLENTOWN**CASE PROCESSING CLERKS**

Evelyn Renner 610-776-6114
 Lauren B. Sampson 610-776-6121
 Matthew A. Sheetz 610-776-6116
 Kris Yerry 610-776-6115

SUPERVISOR OF COURT REPORTERS

Joan Carr 267-299-7104

OFFICIAL COURT REPORTERS

Kathleen Feldman 215-779-5578

Lynn McCloskey 856-649-4774

Suzanne White 215-627-1882

Gregg Wolfe 215-925-6409

COMPUTER ROOM

267-299-7070

ALLENTOWN OFFICE

Michael E. Kunz, Clerk of Court
U.S. District Court, ED of PA
504 W. Hamilton Street, Suite 1601
Allentown, PA 18101-1500

Craig R. Kroznuski 610-776-6117

Evelyn Renner 610-776-6114

Lauren B. Sampson 610-776-6121

Matthew A. Sheetz 610-776-6116

Kris Yerry 610-776-6115

READING OFFICE

Michael E. Kunz, Clerk of Court
U.S. District Court, ED of PA
The Madison Building
400 Washington Street
Suite 401
Reading, PA 19601

Teri Lefkowitz 610-320-5030

Judy Mack 610-320-5006

Marcie Silfies 610-320-9821

**PRO SE LAW
HABEAS CORPUS CLERK**

Leslie Marant 267-299-7511

PRO SE LAW CLERKS

Elaine Battle 267-299-7034

Miriam Silberstein 267-299-7033

Adler, Eileen	267-299-7399	Dempsey, Thomas	267-299-7018
Alia, Vincent	267-299-7238	Diaz, Donna L.	267-299-7089
Andrews, Edward	267-299-7771	DiNapoli, Michele	267-299-7147
Andrews, Maria	267-299-7108	DiSanti, Lorraine	267-299-7790
Arrow, John	267-299-7235	Drobonick, Deana	267-299-7091
Ayala, Aida	267-299-7099	Druding, Jr., Frederick	267-299-7046
		Dunleavy, Kevin	267-299-7087
Baback, Daniel	267-299-7153	Duvak, Kenneth E.	267-299-7082/83
Bakker, Donna	267-299-7171		
Battle, Elaine	267-299-7034	Eggert, Alex	267-299-7216
Beck, James	267-299-7196	Ehly, Christopher	267-299-7245
Beck, Michael	267-299-7409	Eibel, Kevin	267-299-7035
Benitez, Fernando	267-299-7025	El-Shabazz, A' iShah	267-299-7759
Bobb, Eileen J.	267-299-7016	Ervin, Charles	267-299-7559
Boraske, Mark	267-299-7052		
Bowman, Larry	267-299-7029	Fehrle, Robert D.	267-299-7001
Bowman, Sherry	267-299-7067	Feldman, Kathleen	215-779-5578
Bozzelli, Donna	267-299-7539	Feldman, Patricia	267-299-7441
Brady, Lisa	267-299-7158	Finegan, James	267-299-7097
Broderick, Ian	267-299-7641	Finney, Michael	267-299-7084
Buenzle, Laura	267-299-7769	Firestone, Jane	267-299-7014
Burge, Angela	267-299-7160	Fitzko, Jennifer	610-391-7019
Burton-Hoop, Rosalind	267-299-7467	Flores, Constantine	267-299-7191
Butler, Britney	267-299-7234	Follmer, Andrew	267-299-7226
		Franzese, Christina	267-299-7639
Cabrera, Jenniffer	267-299-7227	Frazier, Amanda	267-299-7177
Campbell, Ken	267-299-7082/83	Fretz, Casey	267-299-7142
Campoli, Christopher	267-299-7629	Furphy, Katie	267-299-7286
Cammy, Shawn A.	267-299-7282	Furtek, Stanislaw	267-299-7058
Carey, Steven	267-299-7082/83		
Cardona, Carlos	267-299-7023	Gallagher, Margaret	267-299-7349
Carr, Joan	267-299-7104	Gallelli, Jenna Marie	267-299-7248
Carter, Sharon	267-299-7419	Giambrone, Thomas	267-299-7024
Chin, Lucy	267-299-7112	Gilchrist, Raymond	267-299-7057
Ciamaichelo, Mark	267-299-7145	Gill, Stephen	267-299-7009
Cleek, Elizabeth	267-299-7049	Goldshteyn, Inna	267-299-7222
Cocci, Matthew	267-299-7094	Goss, Carolanne	267-299-7077
Coco, Miriam	267-299-7085	Grace, Harry	267-299-7489
Conboy, Jean	267-299-7050	Haggerty, Kelly Ann	267-299-7283
Cosgrove, Michael	267-299-7284	Hall, Joseph	267-299-7107
Coyle, Michael	267-299-7359	Hall, Sharon	267-299-7591
Crispell, Kathrynne	267-299-7589	Hartman, Dennis	267-299-7609
Croce, Donna	267-299-7659	Hauger, Carl J.	267-299-7082/83
Cruz, Jimmy	267-299-7224	Hayes, David	267-299-7041
		Hearn, Michael	267-299-7039
D'Urso, Nicole	267-299-7017	Helmer, Michele	267-299-7006
Davis, Juanita	267-299-7691	Henry, Christian	267-299-7193
De Cerchio, Dan	267-299-7055	Hevener, Ulie	267-299-7296
Deitz, James	267-299-7022	Higgins, Matthew	267-299-7369
DelCampo, Frank	267-299-7010	Hohenstein, Jo-Anne	267-299-7076
DeLisle, Nancy	267-299-7789	Hull, Milahn V.	267-299-7069
DelRossi, Michael	267-299-7219	Hutelmyer, Michael	267-299-7095
DeLuca, Dan	267-299-7054		
		Iannacone, Stephen	267-299-7211

Jeffers, Sheila	267-299-7169	Nicholas, Helen	610-391-7025
Jerry, Linda	267-299-7026	Noll, Kyle John	267-299-7064
Johnson, Brian E.	267-299-7277		
Jones, Bryant	267-299-7172	O'Connor, Mary Grace	267-299-7066
Jones, Patricia	267-299-7072	O'Connor, Sean	267-299-7056
Jones, William	267-299-7063	O'Driscoll, Peter	267-299-7173
Karlson, Lara L.	267-299-7670	O'Reilly, Michael J.	267-299-7131
Keller, Gregg	267-299-7194	Olson, Gail	267-299-7060
Kelly, Patrick	267-299-7236	Owens, Michael	267-299-7619
Kim, May	267-299-7143		
Kopacz, Kirk	267-299-7002	Parkinson, Charles	267-299-7144
Kroznuski, Craig R.	610-776-6117	Pepin, Kristen	267-299-7003
Kunz, Michael E.	215-597-9221	Phillippi, Nicole	267-299-7288
Kurek, Chris	215-597-7704	Pratt, Erica	267-299-7499
		Prudente, AnnaMarie	267-299-7081
Lamb, Lisa Deangelo	267-299-7043	Puchon, Danielle	267-299-7048
LaRosa, Jerry	267-299-7129	Purnell, Elizabeth	267-299-7579
Lavin, Joseph	267-299-7007		
Lee, Omar	267-299-7154	Rafferty, Mark	267-299-7319
Lefkowitz, Teri	610-320-5030	Renner, Evelyn	610-776-6114
Lombardi, Paul	267-299-7078	Renz, Susan L.	267-299-7218
Lu, Nelly	267-299-7195	Reynolds, Tashia	267-299-7004
Lucca, Christopher	267-299-7422	Richardson, Terry	267-299-7109
Lucini, Jeffrey	267-299-7214	Robinson, Zachary	267-299-7111
Lui, Liana	267-299-7243	Roman, Suzy	267-299-7020
Lutz, Janice	267-299-7291	Rosser, Peggy	267-299-7062
MacElderry, Shelli	215-597-6079	Sabol, Richard	267-299-7011
Mack, Andrea	267-299-7179	Sampson, Carol	267-299-7174
Mack, Judy	610-320-5006	Sampson, Lauren B.	610-776-6121
Makely, Kristin R.	267-299-7389	Scarengelli, Marion	267-299-7739
Malave, Nelson	267-299-7213	Scheidt, James	267-299-7439
Mani, Michael	267-299-7071	Scott-Hayden, Kimberly	267-299-7075
Mann, Adrienne	267-299-7289	Settles, Chavela	267-299-7660
Marant, Leslie	267-299-7511	Sheetz, Matthew A.	610-776-6116
Masters, Marilou	267-299-7079	Sienkiewicz, Michael	267-299-7030
Mastrangelo, Ashley	267-299-7232	Silberstein, Miriam	267-299-7033
Matkowski, Joseph	267-299-7220	Silfies, Marcie	610-320-9821
Matlack, Susan	267-299-7051	Sobieski, Eric	267-299-7241
McCann, Thomas	267-299-7379	Sochanski, Ronald	267-299-7065
McCloskey, Lynn	856-649-4774	Sonnie, Stephen	267-299-7509
McCormack, Daniel	267-299-7021	Stevenson, Deborah	267-299-7721
McDermott, Trevor	267-299-7096	Stipa, Margaret	267-299-7047
McGovern, James	267-299-7059	Stolinski, Heather	267-299-7159
McLaughlin, Patrick	267-299-7146	Stratton, Kelly	267-299-7113
Medina, Jr., Orlando	267-299-7015	Struble, Richard	267-299-7100
Michalik, Diane	267-299-7242	Stutz, Lori	267-299-7098
Milano, Theresa	267-299-7013	Sweeney, Michael P.	267-299-7082/83
Molony, Dawn	267-299-7247	Swierczynski, Gregg	267-299-7230
Montovani, Jon	267-299-7053	Szymanski, John	267-299-7186
Moran, Lauren	267-299-7086		
Mordeczko, Peter	267-299-7110		
Morrissy, Edward	267-299-7044		
Murphy, Ann	267-299-7068		

Taylor, Dennis	267-299-7121	Weissman, Brian	267-299-7215
Thieme, Richard	267-299-7285	White, Suzanne	215-627-1882
Tipping, Lisa	267-299-7701	Whitfield, Jessica	267-299-7161
Tomas, Steve	267-299-7028	Williams, Greg	267-299-7244
Todd, Jordan	267-299-7170	Williams, Kimberly	267-299-7005
Tumminello, Anthony	610-252-7548	Wilson, Jamie L.	267-299-7092
		Wilson, Ken	267-299-7088
Vample, Karen	267-299-7061	Wittje, Lenora Kashner	267-299-7529
Vance, Ronald	267-299-7429	Wolf, Raymond	267-299-7223
Vecchione, Janet M.	267-299-7074	Wolfe, Gregg	215-925-6409
		Wood, Justin	267-299-7280
Walton, Joseph	267-299-7073		
Ward, Madeline	267-299-7549	Yerry, Kris	610-776-6115
Ward, Shelia	267-299-7080		
Wardlaw, Crystal	267-299-7212	Zarnowski, Regina M.	267-299-7810

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	ELECTRONIC CASE FILING PROCEDURES
APPENDIX B	PDF FILE INFORMATION
APPENDIX C	VALIDATION OF SIGNATURE FORM, LOCAL RULE 5.1.2
APPENDIX D	ELECTRONIC CASE FILING ACCOUNT REGISTRATION FORM
APPENDIX E	ELECTRONIC CASE FILING TRAINING REGISTRATION
APPENDIX F	DESIGNATION FORM
APPENDIX G	DISCLOSURE FORM
APPENDIX H	CIVIL COVER SHEET
APPENDIX I	CIVIL CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM
APPENDIX J	MODIFICATION OR REDACTION OF PERSONAL IDENTIFIERS, LOCAL RULE 5.1.3
APPENDIX K	CONSENT TO FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION OF NOTICES OF ORDERS
APPENDIX L	MAIL INFORMATION FORM
APPENDIX M	JUDGES' ROOM NUMBERS AND ZIP CODE + 4-DIGIT EXTENSION NUMBERS
APPENDIX N	SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION
APPENDIX O	WRIT OF EXECUTION
APPENDIX P	APPELLATE TRANSCRIPT PURCHASE ORDER

APPENDIX QCONSENT TO PROCEED BEFORE A
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

APPENDIX RBILL OF COSTS

APPENDIX SSPECIAL LISTING AGREEMENT

APPENDIX T BUSY SLIP

APPENDIX USTANDING ORDER RE: SENTENCING REFORM ACT OF 1984

APPENDIX VCREDIT CARD COLLECTIONNETWORK AUTHORIZATION FORM

APPENDIX W BAIL BOND SECURED BY PROPERTY OR REAL ESTATE BOND

APPENDIX XATTORNEY ADMISSIONS APPLICATION

APPENDIX YTRANSCRIPT ORDER FORM

APPENDIX ZTAPE ORDER FORM

APPENDIX AAAMENDMENT TO LOCAL RULE 5.1.2 AND NOTICE OF
ELECTRONIC AVAILABILITY OF TRANSCRIPTS

APPENDIX BB DIGITAL AUDIO FILE ELECTRONIC ACCESS PILOT PROGRAM

APPENDIX CC **PACER** – PUBLIC ACCESS TO COURT ELECTRONIC
RECORDS REGISTRATION FORM

APPENDIX DD DIRECTORY OF COURT-AUTOMATED SERVICES

APPENDIX EEELECTRONIC CASE FILING - ELECTRONIC FILING
OF COMPLAINTS INFORMATION FORM

INDEX

- Admissions, *SEE* ATTORNEY ADMISSIONS
- After-Hours Contact for Emergency Matters, 107
- After-Hours Filing Depository, 108
- Amended Complaint (Filing an), 25
- Appeals, *SEE* NOTICE OF APPEAL
- Appendices (List of), 131
- Arbitration, 41
- Attachments for Trial, 103
- Attorney Admissions, 113
- Bail Bonds, 113
- Busy Slips, 103
- Case Management Track Designation Form, 24
- Case Number (How to Find a), 108
- Cause of Action, 22, 23
- Cell Phones, 120
- Central Violations Bureau (CVB), 112
- Certificate of Service, 29
- Certification of Judgment (AO 451), 44
- Civil Action (Procedure for Filing), 16
- Civil Category, 19
- Civil Cover Sheet, 20
- Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan, 18
- Class Action Complaints, 25
- Clerk's Index File by Nature of Suit, 109
- Complaints,
 - Amended, 25
 - Class Action, 25
 - Copies of, 25
 - Filing, 16
 - Third-Party, 29
- Copies of Paper Documents (Number of), 28
- Copy work, 109
- Continuances, 103
- Court Reporting/Recording Services, 115
- Courtroom Deputy Clerks, 100, 105
- Credit Card Collection Network, 109
- Default Judgment, 39
- Demand for Trial De Novo, 42
- Depositing/Withdrawing Monies, 110
- Designation Form, 18
- Digital Audio File Electronic Access, 115
- Directory,
 - Personnel, Office of the Clerk of Court, 122
 - Public Telephone Locations, 121
- Disclosure Statement, 18
- Discovery, 39
- Documents, 27
- ECF (Electronic Case Filing), 1
- ECF Password, 5
- ECF Registration, 5
- ECF Training, 15
- Electronic Case Filing (ECF), 1
- Electronic Sound Recording, 114-115
- Electronic Transcripts, 114
- Emergency Matters, After-hours Contact, 107
- Excluded Cases and Documents, 13
- Excluded Personal Identifiers, 30
- Excuse from Jury Service on Request, 117
- Exhibits, 104

Facsimile Transmission of Notices of Orders and Judgments, 33

False Claims Act Cases, 32

Fees,
 Attorney Admission, 113
 Certificate of Admission, Duplicate, 113
 Certificate of Good Standing, Duplicate, 113
 Civil Action, 16
 Federal Records Center, 109-111
 Foreign Subpoenas, 38
 Name Search, 109
 Notice of Appeal, 42
 PACER access, 118
 Witness, 37-38

File Room, *SEE RECORDS ROOM*

Filing,
 Amended Complaint, 25
 Civil Action, 16
 Default, 39
 Subpoenas, 36, 38

Fines, 112

Foreign Subpoenas, 38

Index to Civil Actions by Subject, 109

Internet Website, 119

Interpreters' Services, 116

Judgment by Default, 39

Judicial Opinions, 108

Jurisdiction, 36

Jury Selection, 117

Jury Service (Term of), 117

JUST-ASK (Judicial Schedule of Trials – Automated System Inquiry), 102

Kiosk, 103

Lobby Kiosk Information System, 103

Local Rules, 120

Locate a Case Number, 109

Mail, 33

MDL (Multidistrict Litigation), 40

Motions, 35, 104

Multidistrict Litigation (MDL), 40

Nature of Suit, 21

Notice of Appeal, 42

Opinions/Correspondence, 108

PACER - Public Access to Court Electronic Records, 118

Patent, "Little Tucker Act" Cases, 43

PDF (Portable Document Format), 4

Personal Identifiers, Excluded, 30

Pleadings, 7, 17, 28-29, 31-32

Portable Document Format (**PDF**), 4

Post Judgment Interest Rate, 45

Pretrial Practices, 100

Privacy, Electronic Case File, 30

Privacy Act, 110

Records Room, 109

Referral to U.S. Magistrate Judge, 45

Registration,
 ECF Filing User, 5
 Excuse From, 4

Registry Fund, Deposit Fund, Interest-Bearing Accounts, 111

Related Cases, 19, 24

Scheduling Cases, 100

Sealed Pleadings, 31

Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, 107

Service of Process, 26

Signature (ECF), 9

Social Security (Explanatory Information), 21

Special Listing, 101

Special Management Case, 24
Subpoenas, 36
 Foreign, 38
Summons, 35

Taxation of Costs, 47
 Allowable District Court Costs, 48
 Burden of Proof re: Normally Allowable Costs, 51
 General Objections, 52
 Normally Unallowable District Court Costs, 49
 Specific Objections, 60
 Special Procedures, 69
 Taxation of Appellate Court Costs, 70
Telephone (Public, Directory of Locations), 121
Temporary Restraining Order (T.R.O.), 39
Third-Party Complaint, 29
Transcripts Order, 115
Transcripts, Electronic, 115
Trial De Novo Demand, 42
Trial List (Publication of), 101
Trial Pool, 101
T.R.O. (Temporary Restraining Order), 39

Validation of Signature (ECF), 3-4
Verifications, 25
Video Conferencing, 115
Videotape Services, 115

Waiver of Service, 26
Weather (Inclement), 118
Website, 119
Writs of Garnishment, Attachment and Execution, 39