

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
ORLANDO DIVISION

ANTHONY WAYNE SWAIN  
WASHINGTON, JR,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No: 6:24-cv-1484-JSS-LHP

TRANSPORTATION AND  
SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,

Defendant.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**ORDER**

Plaintiff, Anthony Wayne Swain Washington, Jr., proceeding pro se, brought this action against Defendant, the Transportation and Security Administration (TSA), alleging that some of its federal travel regulations violate Plaintiff's constitutional rights. (*See* Dkt. 1.) On November 22, 2024, United States Magistrate Judge Leslie Hoffman Price entered a report and recommendation recommending that Plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis (Dkt. 2) be denied without prejudice and that Plaintiff's complaint (Dkt. 1) be dismissed without prejudice for failure to comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. (Dkt. 25.) On December 2, 2024, Plaintiff filed a fifty-page objection to the report and recommendation. (Dkt. 30). On December 4, 2024, the court struck Plaintiff's objection for, among other things, failure to comply with Local Rule 3.01(a), which states that "[a]n objection to a report and recommendation must not exceed ten pages." (Dkt. 32.) The court granted Plaintiff

leave to file a compliant objection within fifteen days of that order. (*Id.* at 2.) Plaintiff has not filed a compliant objection, and the time to do so has expired.

After conducting a careful and complete review of the findings and recommendations, a district judge “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); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72. With respect to non-dispositive matters, the district judge “must consider timely objections and modify or set aside any part of the order that is clearly erroneous or is contrary to law.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a); *see Jordan v. Comm’r, Miss. Dep’t of Corr.*, 947 F.3d 1322, 1327 (11th Cir. 2020). For dispositive matters, the district judge must conduct a de novo review of any portion of the report and recommendation to which a timely objection is made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3); *United States v. Farias-Gonzalez*, 556 F.3d 1181, 1184 n.1 (11th Cir. 2009) (“A district court makes a de novo determination of those portions of a magistrate’s report to which objections are filed.”). Even in the absence of a specific objection, the district judge reviews any legal conclusions de novo. *See Cooper-Houston v. S. Ry. Co.*, 37 F.3d 603, 604 (11th Cir. 1994); *Ashworth v. Glades Cnty. Bd. of Cnty. Comm’rs*, 379 F. Supp. 3d 1244, 1246 (M.D. Fla. 2019).

Upon conducting a careful and complete review of the Magistrate Judge’s findings, conclusions, and recommendations, and giving de novo review to matters of law, the court adopts the report and recommendation in full.

Accordingly:

1. Plaintiff’s complaint (Dkt. 1) is **DISMISSED without prejudice**.

2. Plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis (Dkt. 2) is **DENIED without prejudice**.
3. Plaintiff may file an amended complaint and a renewed motion to proceed in forma pauperis on or before January 10, 2025. If Plaintiff renews his motion to proceed in forma pauperis he shall use the Application to Proceed in District Court Without Prepaying Fees or Costs (Long Form).<sup>1</sup>

**ORDERED** in Orlando, Florida, on December 20, 2024.



JULIE S. SNEED  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Copies furnished to:  
Unrepresented Party

---

<sup>1</sup> The form is available on the court's website, <https://www.flmd.uscourts.gov>, by selecting "For Litigants," and "Litigants Without Lawyers," and then selecting "Forms."