

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

**TONI MOLINA, *et al.*,**

**Plaintiffs,**

**v.**

**Case No: 8:16-CV-2214-T-27TGW**

**ACE HOMECARE LLC, BRL  
INVESTMENTS, LLC, ARTHUR  
BARLAAN and JOCELYN BARLAAN,**

**Defendants.**

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**ORDER**

**BEFORE THE COURT** is the Report and Recommendation from the Magistrate Judge recommending final approval of the settlement between Plaintiff and Defendants Ace Homecare LLC and BRL Investments, LLC .<sup>1</sup> (Dkt. 125). No party filed objections and the time for doing so has expired.

A district court may accept, reject or modify a magistrate judge's report and recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of specific objections, there is no requirement that factual findings be reviewed *de novo*, and the court may accept, reject or modify, in whole or in part, the findings and recommendations. § 636(b)(1)(C); *Garvey v. Vaughn*, 993 F.2d 776, 779 n.9 (11th Cir. 1993). Legal conclusions are reviewed *de novo*, even in the absence of an objection. *See LeCroy v. McNeil*, 397 F. App'x 554, 556 (11th Cir. 2010) (citing *United States v. Warren*, 687 F.2d 347, 348 (11th Cir. 1982)); *Cooper-Houston v. S. Ry. Co.*, 37 F.3d 603, 604 (11th Cir. 1994).

After conducting a careful and complete review of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations, and giving *de novo* review to matters of law,

---

<sup>1</sup> The case remains stayed as to Defendants Arthur Barlaan and Jocelyn Barlaan.

1. The Report and Recommendation (Dkt. 125) is **APPROVED** and **ADOPTED** for all purposes, including for appellate review.

2. The WARN Act settlement agreement (90-3) is **APPROVED**.

3. The Clerk is directed to enter the WARN Act judgment (Dkt. 90-4).

**DONE AND ORDERED** this 17th day of July, 2019.

*/s/ James D. Whittemore*

**JAMES D. WHITTEMORE**  
**United States District Judge**

Copies to: Counsel of Record