

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
at GREENEVILLE

SANDRA K. WATSON,)	
)	
<i>Plaintiff,</i>)	
)	Case No. 2:16-cv-260
v.)	
)	Judge Mattice
FINANCIAL ACCOUNTS SERVICE)	Magistrate Judge Corker
TEAM, INC.,)	
)	
<i>Defendant.</i>)	
)	

ORDER

On January 20, 2017, United States Magistrate Judge Clifton Corker filed a Report and Recommendation (Doc. 16) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b). Magistrate Judge Corker recommended that Plaintiff’s Motion for Attorney Fees (Doc. 12) be granted, and that Plaintiff be awarded attorney’s fees in the amount of \$3,380.00.

Neither party has filed objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation.¹ Nevertheless, the Court has reviewed the record in this matter, and the undersigned agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s well-reasoned conclusions.

Accordingly, the Court **ACCEPTS** and **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Corker’s findings of fact and conclusions of law. Plaintiff’s Motion (Doc. 12) is hereby **GRANTED**. Plaintiff **SHALL** be awarded attorney’s fees in the amount of \$ 3,380.00.

¹ Plaintiff secured a default judgment against Defendant (Doc. 9), who has, to date, failed to appear. Every Court order, however, was sent to Defendant at the address provided on the certificate of service. Magistrate Judge Corker specifically advised the parties that they had 14 days in which to object to the Report and Recommendation and that failure to do so would waive their right to appeal. (Doc. 16 at 3 n. 1); *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2); *see also* *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 148-51 (1985) (noting that “[i]t does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate’s factual or legal conclusions, under a de novo or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings”).

SO ORDERED this 18th day of April, 2017.

 /s/ *Harry S. Mattice, Jr.*
HARRY S. MATTICE, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE