

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
ORLANDO DIVISION

LOUEMMA CROMITY,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 6:22-cv-924-CEM-EJK

CITY OF ORLANDO,

Defendant.

_____ /

ORDER

THIS CAUSE is before the Court on Defendant's Amended Motion for Taxation and Costs ("Motion," Doc. 59), to which Plaintiff filed a Response (Doc. 62). The United States Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation ("R&R," Doc. 100), recommending that the Motion be granted in part and denied in part. (*Id.* at 11). Plaintiff filed Objections (Doc. 104).

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), when a party makes a timely objection, the Court shall review *de novo* any portions of a magistrate judge's R&R concerning specific proposed findings or recommendations to which an objection is made. *See also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). *De novo* review "require[s] independent consideration of factual issues based on the record." *Jeffrey S. v. State Bd. of Educ. of Ga.*, 896 F.2d 507, 513 (11th Cir. 1990) (per curiam). The district court "may accept, reject,

or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Here, Plaintiff’s Objections were timely filed. However, her Objections fail to address a particular portion of Magistrate Judge’s findings or recommendations in the R&R. (*See generally* Doc. 104). Plaintiff relies on “the overwhelming and voluminous amount of evidence” in her Motion to Vacate as the basis to overrule the R&R and “stay the enforcement of the taxable costs.” (*Id.* at 2). As explained in the Court’s November 15, 2024 Order (Doc. 110), Plaintiff provided no such evidence to warrant granting the relief requested there nor here. Neither has Plaintiff provided any legal authority permitting the Court to waive post-judgment interest. (*See* Doc. 104 at 2); 28 U.S.C. § 1961(a) (setting forth the general rule that “[i]nterest shall be allowed on any money judgment in a civil case recovered in a district court”).

After review in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72, and considering the Objections, the Magistrate Judge’s recommended disposition is accepted. Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** and **ADJUDGED** as follows:


1. Plaintiff’s Objections (Doc. 104) are **OVERRULED**.
2. The Report and Recommendation (Doc. 100) is **ADOPTED** and made a part of this Order.

3. Defendant's Amended Motion for Taxation and Costs (Doc. 59) is **GRANTED in part** and **DENIED in part**.

a. Defendant is **AWARDED** total costs in the amount of \$3,700.75,¹ plus post-judgment interest beginning from November 15, 2023.

b. In all other respects, the Motion is **DENIED**.

DONE and **ORDERED** in Orlando, Florida on November 21, 2024.



CARLOS E. MENDOZA
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Copies furnished to:

Counsel of Record
Unrepresented Party

¹ This amount consists of \$3,280.75 in costs for printed or electronically recorded transcripts necessarily obtained and \$420.00 in costs for service of subpoenas.