

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
TENNESSEE

Jack L. Slinger v. The Pendaform Company

No. 3:17-cv-00723 · No. 3:17-cv-00723 · Decided January 27, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee adopts without objection a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation concerning Plaintiff Jack Slinger’s request for attorney’s fees and expenses following remand from the Sixth Circuit. The court awards the Puryear Law Group fees for 462.8 hours and \$551.12 in expenses and grants the remaining fees and expenses requested in the supplemental application. The court declines to enter final judgment because a further supplemental request for fees and prejudgment interest remains pending.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Eli Richardson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee
DECIDED	January 27, 2026
DOCKET	3:17-cv-00723
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's report and recommendation concerning Plaintiff's request for attorney's fees, expenses, and prejudgment interest. No party filed objections.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b), the district judge reviews de novo those portions of a magistrate judge's report and recommendation to which a proper objection is made. When no objection is filed, the court is not required to conduct de novo or other independent review.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court order with no reporter citation

TOPICS

- attorney fees
- prejudgment interest
- standard of review
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. What standard governs district-court review of a magistrate judge's report and recommendation concerning attorney's fees and expenses under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b)?
2. Whether, in the absence of objections, the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's recommendation awarding the specified attorney's fees and expenses.
3. Whether the court should enter final judgment and close the case while an additional supplemental request for attorney's fees and prejudgment interest remained pending.

HOLDINGS

1. A district judge is not required to conduct de novo or other independent review of those portions of a magistrate judge's report and recommendation to which no objection is made.
2. The court adopted and approved the report and recommendation in its entirety and awarded the Puryear Law Group fees for 462.8 hours of attorney time and \$551.12 in expenses, together with the remainder of the attorney's fees and expenses requested in Plaintiff's supplement.
3. The court declined to enter judgment and close the case because Plaintiff had filed a further supplement requesting additional attorney's fees and prejudgment interest that had not yet been considered.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Absent objection, the R&R (Doc. No. 197) is adopted and approved in its entirety." (Doc. No. 197 at 7)

"Because Plaintiff has filed a further supplement requesting additional fees and prejudgment interest, the Court declines to enter judgment and close the file at this time." (Order, footnote 4)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

After the action was remanded from the Sixth Circuit, Plaintiff Jack Slinger sought additional attorney's fees, expenses, and prejudgment interest. Defendant did not contest the prejudgment-interest calculation or the reasonableness of the Puryear Law Group's billing rates, but challenged whether the number of hours was reasonable because the submitted invoices were heavily redacted. The magistrate judge reviewed unredacted invoices in camera and recommended awarding fees for 462.8 attorney hours and \$551.12 in expenses, together with the remainder of Plaintiff's requested fees and expenses.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Following remand from the Sixth Circuit, the district court directed the parties to address prejudgment interest and Plaintiff submitted a supplemental request for additional attorney's fees and expenses. The court referred the fee issues to a magistrate judge, who reviewed unredacted invoices in camera and recommended awarding the Puryear Law Group fees for 462.8 hours and \$551.12 in expenses, along with the remainder of the requested fees and expenses. With no objections filed, the district court adopted and approved the report and

recommendation in its entirety, but declined to enter final judgment because Plaintiff had filed another supplement requesting additional fees and prejudgment interest.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Cotton v. City of Eureka, Cal., 889 F. Supp. 2d 1154, 1160 (N.D. Cal. 2012)
- Winning v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec., No. 5:07-CV-03688, 2010 WL 3222031, at *2 (N.D. Ohio Aug. 13, 2010)
- Baldwin v. Golsouth Mgmt., Inc., No. 1:02-CV-00875, 2004 WL 1459392, at *1 (M.D.N.C. June 25, 2004)
- Hart v. Bee Prop. Mgmt., Inc., No. 18-cv-11851, 2019 WL 1242372, at *1 (E.D. Mich. Mar. 18, 2019)
- Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985)
- Ashraf v. Adventist Health Sys./Sunbelt, Inc., 322 F. Supp. 3d 879, 881 (W.D. Tenn. 2018)
- Benson v. Walden Sec., No. 3:18-CV-0010, 2018 WL 6322332, at *3 (M.D. Tenn. Dec. 4, 2018)