

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

**Thomas Alexander Ford v. Greystar Property Management**

Ford · No. 1:26-cv-20909-DPG · Decided May 14, 2026

---

**OPINION**

Ford

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Case No.: 1:26-cv-20909-DPG

THOMAS ALEXANDER FORD,

Plaintiff, v.

GREYSTAR PROPERTY MANAGEMENT,

Defendant. \_\_\_\_\_/

**ORDER**

THIS CAUSE comes before the Court on the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Detra Shaw-Wilder (the “Report”). [ECF No. 10]. On February 11, 2026, pro se Plaintiff Thomas Alexander Ford (“Plaintiff”) filed a Complaint against Defendant Greystar Property Management (“Defendant”). [ECF No. 1]. Contemporaneously, Plaintiff filed a Motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (“IFP Motion”). [ECF No. 4]. The Court denied Plaintiff’s handwritten IFP Motion because the Court was “unable to discern several key pieces of Plaintiff’s information that would assist the Court in making an informed decision on the [IFP] Motion.” [ECF No. 6]. The Court instructed Plaintiff to refile an IFP Motion by or before March 26, 2026. *Id.* Plaintiff did not refile an IFP Motion by March 26, 2026. Then, on April 1, 2026, the Court entered a sua sponte order to show cause, ordering Plaintiff to either (1) pay the filing fee, or (2) file an IFP Motion by April 22, 2026. [ECF No. 7]. To date, Plaintiff has neither paid the filing fee nor filed an IFP Motion. On April 28, 2026, Judge Shaw-Wilder issued her Report recommending that the Court exercise its inherent power to dismiss this case without prejudice. Plaintiff did not file any objections to the Report. A district court may accept, reject, or modify a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). The objected portions of the report and recommendation are accorded de novo review if those objections “pinpoint the specific findings that the party disagrees with.” *United States v. Schultz*, 565 F.3d 1353, 1360 (11th Cir. 2009); see also *Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3)*. Any portions of the report and recommendation to which no specific objection is made are reviewed only for clear error. *Liberty Am. Ins. Grp., Inc. v. WestPoint Underwriters, L.L.C.*, 199 F. Supp. 2d 1271, 1276 (M.D. Fla. 2001); accord *Macort v. Prem, Inc.*,

208 F. App'x 781, 784 (11th Cir. 2006). Given that the parties have not objected to any portion of the Report, the Court reviewed the Report for clear error. Finding no clear error, the Court agrees with Judge Shaw-Wilder's findings and conclusion that this case should be dismissed without prejudice.

#### CONCLUSION

Therefore, it is ORDERED AND ADJUDGED as follows:

- (1) The Report and Recommendation, [ECF No. 10], is ADOPTED in full.
- (2) Plaintiff's Complaint, [ECF No. 1], is DISMISSED without prejudice.
- (3) All pending motions are DENIED as moot.
- (4) The Case is CLOSED.

DONE AND ORDERED in Chambers at Miami, Florida, this 14th day of May, 2026.

DARRIN P. GAYLES

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE