

CITATION: Lajevardi v Performance Services Pty Ltd  
[2022] NTWHC 009

PARTIES: LAJEVARDI

v

PERFORMANCE SERVICES PTY LTD  
(ACN: 162 049 443)

TITLE OF COURT: WORK HEALTH COURT

JURISDICTION: WORK HEALTH

FILE NO(s): 2021-00206-LC

DELIVERED ON: 19 October 2022

DELIVERED AT: DARWIN

HEARING DATE(s): 12 May 2022, 9 & 10 June 2022

JUDGMENT OF: GORDON JR

**CATCHWORDS:**

Taxation of Costs; reasonable offer of compromise; costs of taxation; professional charges

Supreme Court Rules 1987 (NT)  
Supreme Court (General Civil Procedure) Rules 2015 (VIC)  
Supreme Court Rules 2000 (TAS)

*Danielle Rankin v Toll Personnel Pty Ltd* [2019] NTLC 009

**REPRESENTATION:**

Counsel:

Worker: Alannah Grimster

Employer: Matilda Franklin &  
Arlene Lowry

Solicitors:

Worker: Piper Ellis Solicitors

Employer: Sparke Helmore Lawyers

Judgment category classification: B

Judgment ID number: [2022] NTWHC 009

Number of paragraphs: 65

IN THE WORK HEALTH COURT  
AT DARWIN IN THE NORTHERN  
TERRITORY OF AUSTRALIA

No. 2021-00206-LC

BETWEEN:

LAJEVARDI

**Worker**

AND:

PERFORMANCE SERVICES PTY LTD  
(ACN: 162 049 443)

**Employer**

REASONS FOR DECISION

(Delivered 19 October 2022)

**Judicial Registrar Gordon**

1. On 15 November 2021 the Work Health Court at Darwin made an order for costs in favour of the Worker following a contested Hearing in which the Worker was successful. The order for costs was as follows:

*The Employer pay the Worker's costs of an incidental to the proceeding after 6 May 2021 when the proceeding was allocated the hearing dated 21 and 22 October 2021, to be taxed in default of agreement at 100% of the Supreme Court scale and certified fit for counsel at all Directions Hearings, except where otherwise ordered.*

2. It would appear that from the time of the cost Order to the date of taxation the background mechanics of the matter were somewhat turbulent, particularly in circumstances where the Employer's legal representation changed, such that the legal representatives who conducted the taxation, were not the legal firm who conducted the Hearing. Thus, neither the taxing master nor the Employer had the advantage of having been an active participant in the Hearing and its preparation, and were now tasked to review and assess such costs. While common place for the taxing Master, the Employers lack of involvement in the litigation during the period for which costs are claimed, was in my view, an impediment to the taxation.
3. Nonetheless, the taxation commenced on 12 May 2022, focussing initially on the content of Counsel's Invoice issued 17 November 2021. Of note, following an objection of the Employer that the hourly rate charged by counsel was excessive, after consideration of the Northern Territory scale rates for counsel, the complexity of the matter and the skill, reputation and notwithstanding the significant expertise of the Worker's counsel, it was conceded and agreed that a 25% discount ought be applied to Counsels hourly rate across the invoice.

4. At the conclusion of the taxation of counsel's invoice, it was apparent that costs of approximately 18% had been taxed off counsel's bill. Parties then considered Order 63.34 of the *Supreme Court Rules*, in particular o63.34 (5)(a) which provides (**my emphasis**):

*"On the taxation of a bill of costs the Taxing Master may refuse to allow to the solicitor who filed the bill the amount, or any part of the amount, claimed in the bill in respect of the taxation if:*

*(a) the amount of **professional charges** contained in the bill is reduced by 20% more on the taxation."*

5. Parties were in disagreement as to whether a disbursement, being counsels fees, is included in the calculation of professional charges as provided for in o63.34(5)(a). The Taxation was adjourned for parties to file written submissions in support of their preferred interpretation of the definition of professional charges.
6. I note however, that parties did not press for a determination on that issue prior to pressing on with the taxation, which concluded on 10 June 2022.
7. At the conclusion of the taxation, both parties acknowledged that the total amount taxed off the Workers Bill of Costs did not exceed 20%.
8. The outcome of the taxation (of the Bill of Costs filed 15 March 2022 and excluding the costs of taxation which are dealt with separately below) was that the sum of \$13,439.60 was taxed off the Bill.
9. Pre taxation professional fees were sought in an amount of \$32,807.00 together with disbursements in an amount of \$33,146.15, totalling \$65,953.15. After taxation, the amount allowed was \$52,513.55 (excluding the costs of taxation).
10. Further submissions and evidence were subsequently filed by the parties dealing with a number of applications and arguing that the taxing master should exercise the discretions provided for in o.63.34 in various ways.
11. I note that following the filing of the Workers final submissions on 27 June 2022, no further request to be heard, or provide further submissions on any outstanding issue or assertion made by the other party, has been raised by either party<sup>1</sup>.
12. Thus, I take it that the written submissions filed by each party<sup>2</sup> fully represents their position on all outstanding issues and any final taxation determinations should be finalised on the papers, with my written reasons for same contained herein.
13. The matters remaining for determination in order to finalise the taxations are as follows:

---

<sup>1</sup> Despite the Worker inviting the Employer to file a further Notice of Objection to outline any objections to items 359 – 394 of their Bill of Costs filed 15 March 2022 in their *Further Submissions of the Worker on O 63.34(5)&(6) Supreme Court Rules* filed by the Worker on 27 June 2022 at para 15.

<sup>2</sup> *Submissions of the Worker on O 63.34(5)&(6) Supreme Court Rules* filed by the Worker on 20 May 2022; *Employers Submissions of the operation of Order 63.34(5) & (6) of the Supreme Court Rules 1987 (NT) in relation to counsels fees* filed by the Employer on 20 May 2022; *Employers Submissions of the operation of Order 63.34(5) & (6) of the Supreme Court Rules 1987 (NT)* filed by the Employer on 17 June 2022; and *Further Submissions of the Worker on O 63.34(5)&(6) Supreme Court Rules* filed by the Worker on 27 June 2022

14. For the Worker:

- a. Whether the Worker should have their costs of taxation in an amount of \$2,844.00 as set out in the Bill of Costs filed 15 March 2022;
- b. Whether the Worker should have their costs of taxation in an amount of \$3,771.50 as set out in the Supplementary Bill of Costs filed 12 May 2022;
- c. Whether the Worker should have their further costs from 12 May to the finalisation of taxation in an amount of \$10,656.80 as set out in the Further Supplementary Bill of Costs filed 24 June 2022;
- d. Whether order 63.73A should be enlivened by the failure of the Employer to accept a reasonable offer to compromise; and
- e. Whether interest on costs should be paid pursuant to order 63.74.

15. For the Employer:

- a. Whether, pursuant to order 63.34(5)(b) the Worker should be refused any or all costs for failing to accept a reasonable compromise offer;
- b. Whether an equitable adjustment should be made pursuant to order 63.34(5); and
- c. Whether pursuant to order 63.34(6) the solicitor who filed the Bill of Costs should personally pay the costs of the Employers attendance at taxation.

16. I propose to answer each of those questions, some of which have overlapping considerations, by considering the following matters:

- a. Reasonable offers of compromise made by each party and the impact of same on the exercise of my direction regarding the costs of taxation, the operation of o63.73A, Interest under o63.74, the refusal of any costs and any equitable adjustment.
- b. Whether the Employer's costs of taxation should be paid by the Worker's Solicitor.

17. In addition, although by virtue of the 20% threshold not being met, the issue of the inclusion of Counsel's fees in the calculation of 'professional costs' is no longer a live issue in the proceedings, I will also examine this question.

**Negotiations prior to Taxation**

18. The Worker, through the Affidavit of Alanna Mariah Florence Grimster filed 24 June sets out and annexes various negotiations exchanged by the parties. In brief:

- a. 16 December 2021 - Following a successful outcome to his application to the Work Health Court the Worker provided his calculations for the payment of arrears and interest to the Employers then legal representative;
- b. 18 February 2022 - Payment of arrears and interest is confirmed by the Employers new legal representatives and details of costs incurred are sought;
- c. 21 February 2022 - the Worker rejects an offer to resolve costs in an amount of \$49,000 and counter offers \$65,000. This offer subsequently lapses without response;
- d. 16 March 2022 - Summons to attend Taxation of Costs is served on the Employers legal representatives;
- e. 4 April 2022 - the Worker requests details of any updated instructions from the Employer regarding costs;

- f. 14 April 2022 – original date set for Taxation is adjourned at the request of the Employer;
- g. 9 May 2022 – Employer restates offer of \$49,500
- h. 12 May 2022 10.11 am - Employer offers \$54,450 in full and final settlement of costs;
- i. 12 May 2022 1.06 pm – Worker rejects Employers offer and counters with \$63,000;
- j. 12 May 2022 1.59 pm – Employer offers \$58,770 and leaves offer open for acceptance until the commencement of the Taxation;
- k. 12 May 2022 2.00 pm – Taxation commences.

### **Worker's costs of taxation**

19. The Worker seeks costs of taxation in an amount totalling \$17,272.30 being costs of initial taxation<sup>3</sup> (\$2,844.00), further costs of taxation<sup>4</sup> (\$3,771.50) and further costs of taxation<sup>5</sup> (\$10,656.80). These costs have not been subjected to an itemised taxation and are rather opposed by the Employer in their entirety on the basis that the Worker failed to accept a reasonable offer of compromise (o.63.34(5)(b)) and on the basis that it would be equitable for the Court to refuse these costs (o.63.34(5)(c)).
20. The Employer relies upon the offer of \$58,770 as a reasonable offer which was not accepted, noting that ultimately, the amount awarded in the taxation (save for the costs of taxation) is as set out at paragraph 9, in a lesser amount of \$57,764.91.
21. I note that, prior to this offer being conveyed, one minute prior to the commencement of the adjourned taxation, each previous offer had been below the amount allowed. The Worker had very limited opportunity to consider this offer in a reasonable fashion, save for seeking to adjourn the taxation, which had already been set back one month due to the lack of readiness of the Employer in April.
22. Noting the Worker's attempts to engage in negotiations in February and April and the Employers efforts to resolve the question of costs primarily occurring in the days prior to the taxation, I accept the Worker's submission<sup>6</sup> that by the time the offer of \$58,770 was put "*the Worker had incurred post judgment costs in chasing up arrears, attempting to negotiate a costs compromise, drawing its bill of costs in taxable form and considering the 12 pages of objections.*"
23. Although the Employer's offer was subsequently re-put prior to the recommencement of the taxation on 9 June 2022, by this date two additional matters had occurred. Firstly, the Worker had calculated and formed a belief based on the part heard taxation, of the likely outcome of taxation, and the additional costs of attendance at the taxation on 12 May 2022<sup>7</sup> had been incurred.
24. Those factors, together with the Employers insistence that they would be pressing the question of the inclusion of counsel's fees in professional costs<sup>8</sup>, must be considered in an assessment of the reasonableness of the Worker's refusal to accept the Employers offer.

---

<sup>3</sup> Bill of Costs filed 15 March 2022

<sup>4</sup> Supplementary Bill of Costs filed 12 May 2022

<sup>5</sup> Further Supplementary Bill of Costs filed 24 June 2022

<sup>6</sup> *Further Submissions of the Worker on O 63.34(5)&(6) Supreme Court Rules* filed by the Worker on 27 June 2022 at para 63

<sup>7</sup> \$1,020 per item 440 Further Supplementary Bill of Costs filed 24 June 2022

<sup>8</sup> Annexure AG-7 of the Affidavit of Alanna Mariah Florence Grimster filed 20 May 2022

It was becoming abundantly clear that minimal concessions would be forthcoming by either party with respect to the issue of costs.

25. In my view, if put in a reasonable fashion prior to the taxation and the incurring of costs associated with preparation and attendance, the Employer's offer of \$58,770 may be considered reasonable and effect the Worker's entitlement to the costs of taxation. However, in all of the circumstances of the taxation I do not consider that this offer sufficient to invoke my discretion under o63.34 (5) (b) and refuse the Worker his costs of taxation.
26. Noting the Employer's objection to the costs of taxation is in the nature of 'all of nothing' and the Employer has not filed any further Objection to Bill of Costs in response to the Worker's further bills<sup>9</sup>, I do not intend to disturb the Workers costs of taxation as sought.
27. The Worker will be awarded his costs of and incidental to the taxation in an amount of \$17,272.30 (ex GST).

### **Equitable adjustment**

28. The Employers claim for an equitable reduction in the Workers costs of taxation is made on two grounds:
  - a. That duplicated attendances of solicitor and counsel were allowed despite the decision in *Rankin v Toll Holdings Limited (Rankin)*<sup>10,11</sup> and
  - b. That the Employers reasonable offer of compromise exceeded the amount claimed by the Worker in both the Bill of Costs<sup>12</sup> and Supplementary Bill of Costs<sup>13,14</sup>
29. In relation to the first submission it is acknowledged that items of duplication between counsel and the Workers solicitors have been allowed. The rationale and basis for this was discussed at the taxation<sup>15</sup>. Objections were dealt with as they arose and discretion applied to each item following the submissions of the legal representatives. I note the author of the Employers written submissions, which refer to the misapplication of *Rankin*, was not in attendance at the taxation of 12 May 2022 when counsel's bill was taxed.
30. The findings in *Rankin* were not absolute and allow for discretion when dealing with duplications. In my view, being unsatisfied with the outcome of objections resolved in the other parties favour is not grounds for an equitable adjustment.
31. With regard to the second argument, I respectfully concur with the submissions of the Worker<sup>16</sup> that the calculations and argument therein is difficult to discern.

---

<sup>9</sup> See note 1

<sup>10</sup> Work Health Court of the Northern Territory, JR Gordon, 7 May 2020

<sup>11</sup> *Employers Submissions of the operation of Order 63.34(5) & (6) of the Supreme Court Rules 1987 (NT) in relation to counsels fees* filed by the Employer on 20 May 2022 at paras 43 - 46

<sup>12</sup> Filed 15 March 2022

<sup>13</sup> Filed 12 May 2022

<sup>14</sup> *Employers Submissions of the operation of Order 63.34(5) & (6) of the Supreme Court Rules 1987 (NT)* filed by the Employer on 17 June 2022 at paras 17 - 20

<sup>15</sup> Noting taxation matters are not conducted in open Court, no transcript or recording is available.

<sup>16</sup> *Further Submissions of the Worker on O 63.34(5)&(6) Supreme Court Rules* filed by the Worker on 27 June 2022 at para 18

32. I have dealt with the reasonableness of the Employers offer of compromise and its impact on the Workers costs of taxation above. I do not intend to make any further equitable adjustment on the basis of the offer of \$58,770.

#### **Rule 63.73A Increase in costs if offer of compromise is not accepted**

33. The Worker relies on his offers of settlement of \$65,000 and \$63,000, in support of the submission that o.63.73A should be invoked and the Workers costs increased in an amount of 20%<sup>17</sup>.
34. The Worker acknowledged that o.63.73A is a discretionary provision and relies on '*all of the circumstances of the matter as set out herein*'<sup>18</sup>.
35. After considering the workers written submissions with respect to the reasonableness of the parties' actions in taking steps towards finalisation of all matters including costs I acknowledge the application is not without some merit. I am likewise satisfied that the Worker meets the test to be eligible for an adjustment as provided for in o.63.73A.
36. Nonetheless, noting in particular, the Workers costs of taxation have been allowed in full, I am not minded to exercise my discretion in order to increase the Worker's costs. I am satisfied that the final certificate of taxation to be issued is reasonable in all of the circumstances.

#### **Rule 63.74 Interest on costs**

37. I am satisfied, having considered the evidence filed by the parties in relation to the matters to be considered in taxation, that there has been delay occasioned on behalf of the Employer. A post judgment change in instructing solicitors resulted in concerns of dual representation, impeded the progress of negotiations, caused uncertainty regarding instructions to accept service and ultimately gave rise to the adjournment of the first listed date for taxation.
38. Although it may be argued these matters don't necessarily constitute non-compliance with Rules of the court as contemplated by o.63.74 I am satisfied the exercise of discretion under o.63.74 is not solely constrained to such matters. I accept the Worker's submission that an order for interest, on a portion of the bill should be made. Interest in an amount of 6.10% will be applied for items 1 – 394 of the Bill of Costs (items allowed not taxed off only), including allowed disbursements, from the date of the Order for costs to the date of these Orders.

#### **Employer's costs of taxation**

39. The Employer seeks that the solicitor who filed the Bill of Costs to personally pay the Employers costs of attending the taxation.
40. Provision for same is made by o.63.34(6) which provides (my emphasis):

*"...if on the taxation of a bill of costs the amount of professional charges contained in the bill is reduced by 20% or more, the Taxing Master may direct the solicitor who*

---

<sup>17</sup> Further Submissions of the Worker on O 63.34(5)&(6) Supreme Court Rules filed by the Worker on 27 June 2022 at para 70

<sup>18</sup> Ibid

*filed the bill to personally pay the costs of attending the taxation incurred by a party who:*

- (a) appeared on the taxation; and*
- (b) in the opinion of the Taxing Master, had a right to appear.*

41. At the most favourable interpretation for the Employer, the Worker could be said to have had his initial Bill of Costs reduced by 20.4% if the taxed off amount of \$13,439.60 was considered against the professional costs and disbursements which totalled \$65,953.15. However this fails to account for the allowances for the costs of preparation and attendance at taxation.
42. In my view the Employer is not entitled to invoke o.63.34 (6). However, for the avoidance of doubt, even if the argument stems from the narrow construal of professional charges set out above, there being such a negligible encroachment beyond 20% it would not, in my view, give rise for the need for a personal costs order against the filing solicitor. Furthermore, I accept the submissions of the Worker who contends that the taxation was not brought unreasonably<sup>19</sup>.

### **GST**

43. The Employer, relying on o.63.75 (1), contends that GST is not payable on the professional charges on the Bill of Costs.
44. The *Supreme Court Rules 1987* ('the Rules')<sup>20</sup> provides "*In taxing a bill, the Taxing master may allow a reasonable amount for GST paid or payable on **other taxed costs in the bill***" (emphasis added).
45. I do not accept the Employers interpretation with regard to the entitlement to GST. 'Other taxed costs' is not expressly defined however, the rule does not specify that GST is payable on disbursements only or expressly preclude GST on professional costs.
46. In my view the rule operates in a permissive manner, explicitly allowing for GST to be allowed, I cannot be satisfied that it was drafted with a view to being prohibitive of GST on professional costs or to conclude that 'other taxed costs' ought be interpreted to exclude professional costs.

### **Counsel's fees as 'professional charges'**

47. The taxation commenced with a taxation of the fees of counsel which were sought as part of the disbursements incurred by the Worker. Following the initial taxation a question arose as to whether the fees of counsel, which are in the nature of legal professional services but paid in the manner of a disbursement might be considered 'professional charges' for the purposes of o.63.34(5)&(6) of the *Rules*.
48. Parties were directed to file submissions in support of their respective positions and, although the finalisation of the taxation has rendered the question mute, there is some merit in considering the question in any event, should the issue arise in the future.
49. The significance of the meaning and scope of 'professional charges' is borne out when determining whether a bill of costs has been reduced by 20% following taxation. If the

---

<sup>19</sup> *Submissions of the Worker on O 63.34(5)&(6) Supreme Court Rules* filed by the Worker on 20 May 2022 at para 24

<sup>20</sup> At o.63.75(1)

threshold is met the paying party may be denied their costs of taxation and be the solicitor who filed the bill may be personally liable for the costs of the paying party. The importance of accurately assessing the 20% threshold is clear.

50. The Worker submits that the rule, and its previous incarnation, have only ever referred to 'professional charges' with nil mention of disbursements. Further o.63.72 which specifically deals with counsel's fees, adopts the terms 'counsel's fees', 'fees' 'costs'. Notably, the terminology 'professional charges' is not adopted or used in relation to counsel's fees in the *Rules*.
51. The Worker also submits that the fact that o.63.64 is silent on the reduction of disbursements should be interpreted that the omission is deliberate and disbursements where not intended to be captured in the 20% calculation.
52. In support of this argument the Worker notes Rule 63.85 of the Victorian *Supreme Court (General Civil Procedure) Rules 2015* provides (emphasis added):

*"If the amount of the **professional charges and disbursements** in any bill of costs ... is reduced by 15 per cent or more unless the Costs Court otherwise ordered, no costs shall be allowed to the solicitor filing the bill for taxation for preparing the bill and for attending taxation."*

53. In contrast the Tasmanian *Supreme Court Rules 2000* at Regulation 865 provides (emphasis added):

*"If, on the taxation of a bill of costs, the amount of the **professional charges** contained in the bill is reduced by a sixth or more –*  
*(a) costs are not allowed to the practitioner for preparing of the bill, attending the taxation or any matter relating to the taxation, unless the taxing officer otherwise determines*

54. And at regulation 847, the form of the bill of costs is noted to contain the following (emphasis added):

*"A bill of costs for taxation –*  
*(a) is to have 5 separate columns, as follows:*  
*(i) the first or left-hand column for dates;*  
*(ii) the second for consecutive numbers of the items;*  
*(iii) the third for the particulars of the services charged for;*  
*(iv) **the fourth for disbursements** ruled in dollars and cents;*  
*(v) **the fifth for the professional charges** ruled in dollars and cents;*  
*and*  
*(b) is to specify the date of each item in the bill; and...*  
*(c) [not relevant]; and*  
*(d) [not relevant]."*

55. Thus in various jurisdictions the legislature has taken steps to very clearly include or exclude disbursements in the overall calculations as to what has been taxed off following taxation. While the *Work Health Court Rules* and the *Supreme Court Rules* do not provide a clear delineation of the interpretation of counsel's fees strictly as a disbursement.

56. The Employer argues that a plain English interpretation of 'professional charge' should result in a finding that the fees of counsel '*acting in his capacity as a legal professional (barrister) and therefore, constitutes a professional charge in its ordinary meaning*'<sup>21</sup>.
57. The Employer adopts the Australian Oxford Dictionary definition of professional being "*a paid occupation, especially one that involved prolonged training and a formal qualification*"<sup>22</sup>
58. I take no issue with the definition and its suitability. However, it cannot be ignored that qualified professionals extend well beyond those people who provide legal representation.
59. The Employer argues that counsel's fees are distinguishable from other disbursements, where one might find commonly find other professional or expert reports obtained during the course of litigation. They argue that the work done by counsel is simply an extension of legal advices and expertise being provided by their instructing solicitor, counsel's fees are itemised in generally the same manner as a solicitor's, and counsel's fees are subjected to taxation under the *Rules*.
60. In my view, were the Court to broaden the scope of 'professional charges there is a very real risk that there will be circumstances where charges, unrelated to legal advice per se, may be professional charges under the Employers interpretation.
61. Naturally, legal services are not the only professional charges which are capable of or routinely subjected to itemisation or an hourly rate breakdown. For instance, a forensic accountant's bill could foreseeably have many similarities to that of a solicitor, rendering it open to an interpretation as being a bill for '*a paid occupation, especially one that involved prolonged training and a formal qualification*'<sup>23</sup>.
62. Further, although the non-legal disbursements may not be subject to detailed scrutiny or guidance under the *Rules*, they are nonetheless, subject to being taxed. A disbursement which is found to be irrelevant or unnecessary is unlikely to survive a taxation. Indeed, in this matter, the daily fees of a medical expert were reduced to a cancellation fee during the taxation.
63. In my view, the distinctions elucidated by the Employer are not sufficient to create a circumstance where *only* counsel's fees can or could be defined as professional charges for the purpose of a taxation.
64. Further, particularly the noting manner in which counsel's fees are dealt with separately from those of a solicitor in the *Rules*, the interstate examples which provide examples of the delineation between the two and the absence of any indicia in the *Rules* to suggest counsels fees were intended to be considered professional charges for the purposes of taxation, I will not adopt such an interpretation.

---

<sup>21</sup> *Employers Submissions of the operation of Order 63.34(5) & (6) of the Supreme Court Rules 1987 (NT) in relation to counsels fees* filed by the Employer on 20 May 2022 at para 22

<sup>22</sup> *Employers Submissions of the operation of Order 63.34(5) & (6) of the Supreme Court Rules 1987 (NT) in relation to counsels fees* filed by the Employer on 20 May 2022 at para 19.1

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid*

## ORDERS

65. The Orders that I will make are as follows:

- a. A Certificate of Taxation to issue for an amount of \$62,213.76 being \$75,653.36 claimed less \$13,439.60 taxed off for the Bill of Costs filed 15 March 2022.
- b. That the Supplementary Bill of Costs filed 12 May 2022 be allowed in full.
- c. That the Further Supplementary Bill of Costs filed 24 June 2022 be allowed in full.
- d. Interest on costs pursuant to o.63.74 on items 1 to 394 of the Bill of Costs filed 15 March 2022 and the disbursements in the Bill of Costs filed 15 March 2022 from 15 November 2021 to the date of these Orders at a rate of 6.1%.