

40 F.4th 593
United States Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit.

ASHLEY W., et al., Plaintiffs-Appellees,
v.
Eric HOLCOMB, Governor of Indiana, et al.,
Defendants-Appellants.

No. 21-3028
|
Decided July 11, 2022

Synopsis

Background: Defendants-appellants obtained reversal of judgment of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana, Richard L. Young, J., in the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, 34 F.4th 588, in action against them brought on children's behalf by children's next friends, and defendant-appellants filed a bill of costs asking that costs be taxed against next friends.

The Court of Appeals, Easterbrook, Circuit Judge, in chambers, held that next friends were not themselves appellees, and costs thus could not be awarded against them.

Request for costs denied.

Procedural Posture(s): On Appeal; Motion to Tax Costs.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana, Evansville Division. No. 3:19-cv-00129-RLY-MPB — **Richard L. Young, Judge.**

Attorneys and Law Firms

Kristen Leigh Bokhan, Kirkland & Ellis LLP, Attorney, Washington, DC, Aaron H. Marks, Attorney, Kirkland & Ellis LLP, New York, NY, Marcia Robinson Lowry, Attorney, A Better Childhood, Inc., New York, NY, for Plaintiffs-Appellees.

John Robert Maley, Peter J. Rusthoven, Dylan Alexander Pittman, Attorneys, Barnes & Thornburg LLP, Indianapolis, IN, Julia Catherine Payne, Esq., Thomas M. Fisher, Melinda R. Holmes, Attorneys, Office of the Attorney General, Indianapolis, IN, for Defendants-Appellants.

David R. Carpenter, Attorney, Sidley Austin LLP, Los Angeles, CA, for Amicus Curiae Nonprofit Child Advocacy Organizations.

Opinion

Easterbrook, Circuit Judge, in chambers.

Appellants (collectively Indiana) prevailed in this appeal, 34 F.4th 588 (7th Cir. 2022), and filed a bill of costs under Fed. R. App. P. 39(a)(3), which provides that “if a judgment is reversed, costs are taxed against the appellee”. But they did not request costs from the appellees, who are children. Instead they sought costs from *594 the next friends who represented the children's interests.

Indiana does not cite, and I could not find, any appellate decision holding that costs may be assessed against next friends under Rule 39(a). The lack of authority is unsurprising, because the Supreme Court has held that next friends are not parties to suits in which they assist minors or incompetent persons. See *Whitmore v. Arkansas*, 495 U.S. 149, 163, 110 S.Ct. 1717, 109 L.Ed.2d 135 (1990); *Morgan v. Potter*, 157 U.S. 195, 198, 15 S.Ct. 590, 39 L.Ed. 670 (1895). Rule 39(a) authorizes awards against losing litigants, not against their agents (which may include lawyers and guardians *ad litem* as well as next friends).

Some district judges have awarded costs against next friends under Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(d)(1) when the next friend is responsible for the child's expenses generally. See, e.g., *C.M.J. v. Walt Disney Parks & Resorts US, Inc.*, 2017 WL 3065111, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 112188 (M.D. Fla. July 19, 2017); *Gohl v. Livonia Public Schools*, 2018 WL 1128254, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 34245 (E.D. Mich. Mar. 2, 2018). That would be so if, for example, a child's parents sue as next friends. But the next friends in this litigation are neither the children's natural parents nor their foster parents. That may explain why Indiana does not ask for an award of costs against the children, as the state may need to reimburse foster parents for the expenses of these children. Indiana does not want a circular award under which it pays with one hand what it receives with the other.

Rule 39's text resolves this subject against Indiana. Its request for an award of costs against the next friends is denied.

All Citations

40 F.4th 593

End of Document