



infringed Jacobs' copyrights in and to four photographs, and that the infringements of two of those copyrights were willful. (Order on Jury Verdict, ECF No. 108.)<sup>1</sup> The jury awarded Jacobs damages of \$54,500.00 plus interest. (Id.) Jacobs moved for attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses under the Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C. § 505, on the ground that he was the prevailing party.

## **II. Law and Analysis**

A "district judge must determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge's disposition that has been properly objected to." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); see also 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). After reviewing the evidence, the court is free to accept, reject, or modify the proposed findings or recommendations of the magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). The district court need not "'review...a [magistrate judge's] factual or legal conclusions [] under a de novo or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings.'" Satkiewicz v. Michigan, No. 2:11-cv-14370, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 124403, at \*3 (E.D. Mich. Aug. 31, 2012.) (quoting Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985) (emphasis in original)). The Supreme Court has "expressly concluded that a district court should adopt the findings and rulings of the magistrate judge to which no specific objection is filed." United States v. Maness, No. 10-

---

<sup>1</sup> All other defendants were dismissed voluntarily or by court order before the conclusion of trial.

20348, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 92238, at \*2 (W.D. Tenn. July 3, 2012.) (citing Arn, 474 U.S. at 151). Otherwise, a district court would be forced "to review every issue in every case, no matter how thorough the magistrate's analysis and even if both parties were satisfied with the magistrate's report. . . . [which] would be an inefficient use of judicial resources." Id. (internal citations omitted); accord Javaherpour v. United States, 315 Fed. Appx. 505, 509 (6th Cir. 2009). The parties have not objected to the Magistrate Judge's Report. Thus, "the Magistrate Judge's determination become[s] that of the district court." Maness, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 92238, at \*3 (internal citations omitted).

### **III. Conclusion**

For the foregoing reasons, the Court ADOPTS the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, and GRANTS Jacobs' Motion in the amount of \$167,022.50 in reasonable attorneys' fees and \$4,676.25 in costs and expenses.

So ordered this 25th day of September, 2012.

s/ Samuel H. Mays, Jr.  
SAMUEL H. MAYS, JR.  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE