

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

JON B. HARDEN,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No: 8:24-cv-00004-MSS-TGW

**CLEARWATER KEY
ASSOCIATION INC. ET AL,**

Defendants.

ORDER

THIS CAUSE comes before the Court for consideration of Plaintiff's Motion to Proceed In Forma Pauperis. (Dkt. 2) Also before the Court is Plaintiff's Complaint. (Dkt. 1) On May 29, 2024, United States Magistrate Judge Thomas G. Wilson issued a Report and Recommendation, recommending the Complaint be dismissed without prejudice, with leave to file an amended complaint. (Dkt. 4) Judge Wilson warned that the opportunity to file an amended complaint does not mean that Plaintiff will be able to state a viable claim. (Id.) Plaintiff has not objected to Judge Wilson's Report and Recommendation, and the deadline for doing so has 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, 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. 4), is **CONFIRMED** and **ADOPTED** as part of this Order.
2. Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint, (Dkt. 1), is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

3. If Plaintiff seeks to file an amended complaint, he may do so no later than **thirty (30) days** from the date of this Order. Plaintiff is warned that if he attempts to file an amended complaint without a fair basis in fact or law, he may be subjected to sanctions pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 11.¹
4. Failure to file an amended complaint within the time allotted as directed will result in this Order becoming a final judgment and dismissal of Plaintiff's case with prejudice. See Auto. Alignment & Body Serv., Inc. v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 953 F.3d 707, 719-20 (11th Cir. 2020).

DONE and ORDERED in Tampa, Florida, this 8th day of November 2024.



MARY S. SCRIVEN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Copies furnished to:
Counsel of Record
Any Unrepresented Person

¹ To the extent Plaintiff intends to continue to represent himself in this matter, he should familiarize himself with both the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Rules for the Middle District of Florida, copies of which can be reviewed in the Clerk's Office, located on the second floor of the Sam M. Gibbons United States Courthouse, 801 North Florida Avenue, Tampa, Florida, or on the court's website at <https://www.flmd.uscourts.gov/local-rules>.