

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
FLORIDA**

Cameron Moore v. Jasmine Redd

Moore v. Redd · No. 25-81107-CIV-CANNON/McCabe · Decided March 9, 2026

OPINION

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA WEST PALM BEACH DIVISION CASE NO. 25-81107-CIV-CANNON/McCabe CAMERON MOORE, Plaintiff, v. JASMINE REDD, Defendant. _____/ ORDER ACCEPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE’S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION THIS CAUSE comes before the Court upon Magistrate Judge McCabe’s Report and Recommendation (the “Report”) on Plaintiff’s Motion to Dismiss Defendant’s Counterclaim [ECF No. 34].

The Report recommends that the Court deny Plaintiff’s Motion to Dismiss [ECF No. 34]. Both Plaintiff and Defendant have filed Notices indicating that they do not object to the Report [ECF Nos. 35–36]. Following review of the Report [ECF No. 34], the Motion [ECF No. 20], and the Notices of No Objection [ECF Nos. 35–36], the Court ACCEPTS the Report [ECF No. 34] and DENIES Plaintiff’s Motion to Dismiss [ECF No. 20]. *** This is a tort action in which Plaintiff alleges that Defendant secretly recorded private conversations without his consent and later disseminated those recordings to third parties in violation of Florida law [ECF No. 10].

Defendant counterclaimed and told a different story, alleging a romantic relationship filled with threats and intimidation that culminated in a sexual battery on November 2, 2023 [ECF No. 16]. On January 15, 2026, Plaintiff moved to dismiss the counterclaim, arguing chiefly that Defendant consented to the parties’ sexual contact [ECF No. 20].

The Court referred the Motion to Magistrate Judge McCabe, who thereafter issued a Report READE INN, 2YTOLLUI ONL NV TN EALNI NALIN, DYER □□□□ is an affirmative defense not properly raised at the motion to dismiss stage [ECF No. 34]. Since the Report issued, both parties have indicated they have no objection to its conclusions [ECF Nos. 35, 36].

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' 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. Following appropriate review, the Court finds the Report to be well reasoned and correct.

For the reasons set forth in the Report [ECF No. 34 pp. 1-11], it is hereby ORDERED AND ADJUDGED as follows: 1. The Report and Recommendation [ECF No. 34] is ACCEPTED. 2. The Motion [ECF No. 20] is DENIED. 3. Plaintiff shall file an Answer to Defendant's Counterclaim [ECF No. 16] on or before March 27, 2026. ORDERED in Chambers at Fort Pierce, Florida, this 9th day of March 2026.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE cc: counsel of record