

*special grounds, without any time limitations.*” (9 Witkin, Cal. Procedure (4th ed. 1997) Appeal, § 733, pp. 762-763.)

**5. This court should recognize that judgments stated in the Opinion are not in the court record. There is no judgment entered of Kramer being awarded \$2,545.28 and prevailing over GlobalTox, even though she did. Kelman did not argue to have Kramer’s costs halved in his motion to tax costs. The court did it of its own accord. There is double standard of the courts halving Kramer’s costs, but not Kelman’s. Falsely stated, Kramer did not have an opportunity to dispute costs incurred by GlobalTox being awarded to Kelman.**

Pages 1,2,10,14 the Opinion states, “*We find no error in the trial court's award of costs.*” “*...the trial court awarded Kelman \$7,252.65 in costs. The jury found that Kramer did not libel GlobalTox and judgment against GlobalTox was entered. The trial court awarded Kramer \$2,545.28 in costs against GlobalTox.*” “*The court entered judgment in favor of Kelman and awarded him \$7,252.65 in costs. The trial court's judgment awarded GlobalTox no damages and by way of a postjudgment proceeding.*” “*Kelman filed a cost bill of \$7,252.65 on October 14, 2008. On October 31, 2008, Kramer filed a motion to strike Kelman's costs and have costs awarded to her as against GlobalTox. In her motion, she argued that as the prevailing party as against GlobalTox she was entitled to an award of costs. With respect to Kelman's cost bill, the only objection she raised was her contention the verdict in Kelman's favor was defective. In her motion, she did not object to any particular item in Kelman's cost bill... On December 12, 2008, the trial court awarded Kelman the \$7,252.65 in costs he claimed. The trial court also permitted Kramer to file a memorandum of costs as against GlobalTox. Thereafter, Kramer filed a motion for costs and GlobalTox filed a motion to tax the costs, in which among other matters GlobalTox*