

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

-----  
ADAN EUCEDA, *individually, and on behalf of  
all others similarly situated,*

Plaintiff,

**ADOPTION ORDER**  
14-cv-03143 (ADS)(SIL)

-against-

PREESHA OPERATING CORP.  
*doing business as* Ranch 1, PREESHA ONE  
OPERATING LLC *doing business as*  
Ranch 1, RAKESH CHADHA,

Defendant(s).

-----X  
**APPEARANCES:**

**Neil H. Greenberg & Associates, P.C.**  
*Attorneys for the Plaintiff*  
4242 Merrick Rd  
Massapequa, NY 11758

By: Neil H. Greenberg, Esq.  
Justin M. Reilly, Esq.,  
Keith E. Williams, Esq., Of Counsel

**NO APPEARANCES:**

**Preesha Operating Corp., Preesha One Operating LLC, Rakesh Chadha**  
*The Defendants*

**SPATT, District Judge.**

On May 19, 2014, the Plaintiff Alan Euceda, acting individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated (the “Plaintiffs”) commenced this Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 216 (the “FLSA”) action against the Defendants Preesha Operating Corp., d/b/a Ranch 1, Preesha One Operating Llc, d/b/a Ranch 1, and Rakseh Chadha (the “Defendants”), seeking to recover unpaid overtime and spread of hours wages.

On June 22, 2015, the Clerk of the Court noted the default of the Defendants. On December 4, 2015, the Plaintiffs moved for a default judgment against the Defendants. On July 13, 2016, Magistrate Judge Steven I. Locke recommended that default judgment be granted in favor of the Plaintiffs against the Defendants; that the Plaintiff be paid for his unpaid overtime and spread of hours wages; that the damages be liquidated; and that the Plaintiff be granted leave to move for attorneys' fees. On September 30, 2016, this Court adopted Magistrate Judge Locke's report and recommendation in its entirety.

On November 30, 2016, the Plaintiff moved for attorneys' fees and costs.

On December 1, 2016, the Court referred the Plaintiff's motion for attorneys' fees and costs to Magistrate Locke for a report and recommendation.

On June 30, 2017, Judge Locke issued a report and recommendation (the "R&R") recommending that the Plaintiff's motion for attorneys' fees and costs be granted; that the Plaintiff be awarded \$7,350 in attorneys' fees and \$350 in costs for a total of \$7,700; and that the remainder of the Plaintiff's application be denied without prejudice with leave to renew upon providing the appropriate supporting documentation.

It has been more than fourteen days since the service of the R&R, and the parties have not filed objections.

As such, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72, this Court has reviewed the R&R for clear error, and finding none, now concurs in both its reasoning and its result. See Coburn v. P.N. Fin., No. 13-CV-1006 (ADS) (SIL), 2015 WL 520346, at \*1 (E.D.N.Y. Feb. 9, 2015) (reviewing Report and Recommendation without objections for clear error).

Accordingly, the R&R is adopted in its entirety.

**SO ORDERED.**

Dated: Central Islip, New York

July 18, 2017

/s/ Arthur D. Spatt  
ARTHUR D. SPATT  
United States District Judge