

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
TAMPA DIVISION**

**DEBRA JACKSON, on behalf of
themselves and those similarly
situated, JOHANNE FILOSSAINT, on
behalf of themselves and those
similarly situated, and CORNELIUS
JOHNSON, on behalf of themselves
and those similarly situated,**

Plaintiffs,

v.

Case No: 8:15-cv-2194-T-35JSS

**INVESTIGATIONS AND SECURITY
BUREAU, INC. and SKIP DRISH,
individually,**

Defendants.

ORDER

THIS CAUSE comes before the Court for consideration of Plaintiffs' Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Costs ("Motion"). (Dkt. 57) In the motion, Plaintiffs seek an award of attorneys' fees and costs incurred in securing the default judgment against Defendants Investigations and Security Bureau, Inc. and Skip Drish. (Id.) Defendants did not respond to the Motion. On October 30, 2018, United States Magistrate Judge Julie S. Sneed issued a Report and Recommendation, recommending that the Motion be granted in part and denied in part and that Plaintiffs be awarded \$11,060.00 in attorney's fees and \$563.50 in costs. (Dkt. 58) Neither party has filed an objection to the Judge Sneed's Report and Recommendation, and the time to do so has now passed.


After conducting a careful and complete review of the findings and recommendations, a district judge may accept, reject, or modify the Magistrate Judge's report and recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Williams v. Wainwright, 681 F.2d 732, 732 (11th Cir. 1982), cert. denied, 459 U.S. 1112 (1983). A district judge “shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). This requires that the district judge “give fresh consideration to those issues to which specific objection has been made by a party.” Jeffrey S. v. State Bd. of Educ., 896 F.2d 507, 512 (11th Cir.1990) (quoting H.R. 1609, 94th Cong. § 2 (1976)). In the absence of specific objections, there is no requirement that a district judge review factual findings *de novo*, Garvey v. Vaughn, 993 F.2d 776, 779 n.9 (11th Cir. 1993), and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings and recommendations. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). The district judge reviews legal conclusions *de novo*, even in the absence of an objection. See Cooper-Houston v. Southern Ry., 37 F.3d 603, 604 (11th Cir. 1994).

Upon consideration of the Report and Recommendation and in conjunction with an independent examination of the file, the Court is of the opinion that the Report and Recommendation should be adopted, confirmed, and approved in all respects. Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that:

1. The Report and Recommendation, (Dkt. 58), is **CONFIRMED** and **ADOPTED** as part of this Order; and
2. Plaintiffs’ Motion for Attorneys’ Fees and Costs, (Dkt. 57), is **GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART**.

3. Plaintiffs are awarded \$11,060.00 in attorney's fees and \$563.50 in costs.

DONE and **ORDERED** in Tampa, Florida, this 26th day of November, 2018.



MARY S. SCRIVEN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Copies furnished to:

Counsel of Record

Any Unrepresented Person