

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
WEST PALM BEACH DIVISION

CASE NO. 22-81379-CIV-CANNON

CHESTER LEE ROBINSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

QUANCIA HERRING, *et al.*,

Defendants.

---

**ORDER ACCEPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S  
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION [ECF No. 166]**

**THIS CAUSE** comes before the Court upon the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation Regarding Plaintiff's Unopposed Motion for Reimbursement of *Pro Bono* Litigation Expenses (the "Report") [ECF No. 166], filed on August 1, 2024. On July 16, 2024, Defendant filed an Unopposed Motion for Reimbursement of *Pro Bono* Litigation Expenses (the "Motion"). [ECF No. 161]. On August 1, 2024, following referral, Judge Reinhart issued a Report recommending that the Motion be granted [ECF No. 166 p. 2]. Objections to the Report were due on August 15, 2024 [ECF No. 166 p. 3]. On August 6, 2024, Plaintiff's counsel filed a notice advising the Court that neither party intended to file any objections to the Report [ECF No. 168 p. 1]. The time to file objections has now expired. [ECF No. 166 p. 3].

To challenge the findings and recommendations of a magistrate judge, a party must file specific written objections identifying the portions of the proposed findings and recommendation to which objection is made. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3); *Heath v. Jones*, 863 F.2d 815, 822 (11th Cir. 1989); *Macort v. Prem, Inc.*, 208 F. App'x 781, 784 (11th Cir. 2006). A district court reviews de novo those portions of the report to which objection is made and 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). To the extent a party fails to object to parts of the magistrate judge's report, the Court may accept the recommendation so long as there is no clear error on the face of the record. *Macort*, 208 F. App'x at 784. 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); *Cooper-Houston v. S. Ry. Co.*, 37 F.3d 603, 604 (11th Cir. 1994).

Following de novo review, the Court finds the Report to be well reasoned and correct. For the reasons set forth in the Report [ECF No. 166 pp. 1–2], it is hereby

**ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** as follows:

1. The Report and Recommendation [ECF No. 166] is **ACCEPTED**.
2. The Motion [ECF No. 161] is **GRANTED**.
3. This case shall remain **CLOSED**.

**DONE AND ORDERED** in Chambers at Fort Pierce, Florida this 27th day of August 2024.

  
**AILEEN M. CANNON**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

cc: counsel of record