

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

----- X

**DISH NETWORK L.L.C.**, :

Plaintiff, :

- against - :

**786 WIRELESS WORLD, INC., 786** :  
**ENTERPRISES, INC., RANA M. AFZAL and** :  
**DOES 1-10,** :

Defendants. :

----- X

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT  
AND RECOMMENDATION**

21-CV-5730 (AMD)(RML)

**ANN M. DONNELLY**, United States District Judge:

On October 14, 2021, the plaintiff filed this action alleging copyright infringement of certain television channels licensed exclusively to the plaintiff. (ECF No. 1.) The defendants filed an untimely answer on Feb. 8, 2022 (ECF No. 8), and later filed an unopposed motion to file a late answer, which Magistrate Judge Robert Levy granted (*see* Order, dated August 24, 2022). On November 7, 2022, the plaintiff filed an amended complaint naming additional defendants. (ECF. No. 30.) Defendants 786 Wireless World, Inc., 786 Enterprises, Inc., Adeel Hussain and Rana M. Afzal filed an answer on November 29, 2022. (ECF No. 35.) As discovery progressed, these four defendants repeatedly refused to engage in discovery efforts or respond to communications from the plaintiff. On February 17, 2023, after multiple unsuccessful attempts to contact these defendants, their counsel filed a letter motion to withdraw as counsel. (ECF No. 50.) On March 15, 2023, the plaintiff moved for default judgment under Rule 37(b)(2)(vi) for not obeying a discovery order.<sup>1</sup> (ECF No. 51.)

---

<sup>1</sup> Six additional defendants named in the amended complaint failed to answer or move in response to the amended complaint. Plaintiff obtained a Clerk’s Certificate of Default with respect to those defendants on January 12, 2023. They are not subject to this order.

Judge Levy granted defense counsel's motion to withdraw, and recommended that the Court enter default judgment against defendants 786 Wireless World. Inc., 786 Enterprises, Inc., Adeel Hussain and Rana M. Afzal, finding them liable for copyright infringement, and direct the plaintiff to file a submission detailing further relief requested. No party has filed an objection to the report and recommendation and the time for doing so has passed.

A district court reviewing a report and recommendation "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)(C). To accept a report and recommendation to which no timely objection has been made, "a district court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record." *VOX Amplification Ltd. v. Meussdorffer*, 50 F. Supp. 3d 355, 369 (E.D.N.Y. 2014).

I have carefully reviewed Judge Levy's thorough and well-reasoned report and recommendation for clear error and find none. Accordingly, I adopt the report and recommendation in its entirety. The plaintiff's motion for default judgment is granted consistent with the report and recommendation.

**SO ORDERED.**

s/Ann M. Donnelly

---

ANN M. DONNELLY  
United States District Judge

Dated: Brooklyn, New York  
May 17, 2023