

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

NORMAN HOEWISCHER,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 3:12-cv-2-J-34TEM

THE PANTRY, INC.,

Defendant.

NORMAN HOEWISCHER,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 3:12-cv-4-J-34TEM

THE PANTRY, INC.,

Defendant.

NORMAN HOEWISCHER,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 3:12-cv-100-J-34TEM

THE PANTRY, INC.,

Defendant.

NORMAN HOEWISCHER,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 3:12-cv-109-J-34TEM

THE PANTRY, INC.,

Defendant.

ORDER

THIS CAUSE is before the Court on the Report and Recommendation (Dkt. No. 54, Case No. 3:12cv2; Dkt. No. 53, Case No. 3:12cv4; Dkt. No. 44, Case No. 3:12cv100; Dkt. No. 65, Case No. 3:12cv109; Report), entered by the Honorable Thomas E. Morris, United States Magistrate Judge, on May 9, 2013. In the Report, Magistrate Judge Morris recommends that Plaintiff's Application for Attorney's Fees, Costs and Expert Fees (Dkt. No. 52, Case No. 3:12cv2; Dkt. No. 51, Case No. 3:12cv4; Dkt. No. 41, Case No. 3:12cv100; Dkt. No. 63, Case No. 3:12cv109) be denied. See Report at 6. Plaintiff has failed to file objections to the Report, and the time for doing so has now passed.

The 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). If no specific objections to findings of facts are filed, the district court is not required to conduct a de novo review of those findings. See Garvey v. Vaughn, 993 F.2d 776, 779 n.9 (11th Cir. 1993); see also 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). However, the district court must review legal conclusions de novo. See Cooper-Houston v. Southern Ry. Co., 37 F.3d 603, 604 (11th Cir. 1994); United States v. Rice, No. 2:07-mc-8-FtM-29SPC, 2007 WL 1428615, at * 1 (M.D. Fla. May 14, 2007).

Upon independent review of the file and for the reasons stated in the Magistrate Judge's Report, the Court will accept and adopt the legal and factual conclusions recommended by the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, it is hereby

ORDERED:

1. The Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (Dkt. No. 54, Case No. 3:12cv2; Dkt. No. 53, Case No. 3:12cv4; Dkt. No. 44, Case No. 3:12cv100; Dkt. No. 65, Case No. 3:12cv109) is **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the Court.

2. Plaintiff's Application for Attorney's Fees, Costs and Expert Fees (Dkt. No. 52, Case No. 3:12cv2) is **DENIED**.

3. Plaintiff's Application for Attorney's Fees, Costs and Expert Fees (Dkt. No. 51, Case No. 3:12cv4) is **DENIED**.

4. Plaintiff's Application for Attorney's Fees, Costs and Expert Fees (Dkt. No. 41, Case No. 3:12cv100) is **DENIED**.

5. Plaintiff's Application for Attorney's Fees, Costs and Expert Fees (Dkt. No. 63, Case No. 3:12cv109) is **DENIED**.

DONE AND ORDERED at Jacksonville, Florida, this 10th day of June, 2013.


MARCIA MORALES HOWARD
United States District Judge

i23

Copies to:

Hon. Thomas E. Morris
Counsel of Record