

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
FLORIDA, JACKSONVILLE DIVISION**

**Sheik Salaam El v. Arra Finance LLC, ICU Recovery, Auto Lounge
of Florida LLC and Crescent Auto Finance**

Sheik Salaam El · No. 3:25-cv-1358-JEP-SJH · Decided February 9, 2026

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA JACKSONVILLE DIVISION SHEIK SALAAM EL, Plaintiff, v. Case No.: 3:25-cv-1358-JEP-SJH ARRA FINANCE LLC, ICU RECOVERY, AUTO LOUNGE OF FLORIDA LLC and CRESCENT AUTO FINANCE, Defendants. _____/ ORDER THIS CAUSE is before this Court on the Report and Recommendation (Doc. 4), entered by the assigned Magistrate Judge on January 14, 2026.

Therein, the Magistrate Judge recommends that Plaintiff’s Application to Proceed in District Court Without Prepaying Fees or Costs (Long Form) (“Motion to Proceed,” Doc. 2) be denied and this case be dismissed without prejudice. (Doc. 4 at 1).

The Magistrate Judge explained that the Motion to Proceed is incomplete, (*id.* at 3), and the complaint is a shotgun pleading because each count incorporates by reference the allegations in all preceding counts, (*id.* at 3–4). Plaintiff did not timely file any objections. This Court “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).

Pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, this Court “must determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge’s disposition that has been properly objected to.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3); see also § 636(b). However, a party waives the right to challenge on appeal any unobjected-to factual and legal conclusions. See 11th Cir. R. 3-1.1 As such, this Court reviews—for plain error and only if necessary, in the interests of justice—those portions of the Magistrate Judge’s findings to which no objection was filed.

See *id.*; see also *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985) (“It does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate[judge’s] factual or legal conclusions, under a de novo or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings.”); *Dupree v. Warden*, 715 F.3d 1295, 1304–05 (11th Cir. 2013) (recommending the adoption of what would become Eleventh Circuit Rule 3-1 so that district courts do not have “to spend significant amounts of time and resources reviewing every issue—whether objected to or not”).

Upon independent review of the file and for the reasons stated in the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, this Court will accept and adopt the legal conclusions and factual findings recommended by the Magistrate Judge. 1 The Magistrate Judge properly informed the parties of the time period for objecting and the consequences of failing to do so. (Doc.

4 at 5–6). Accordingly, it is ORDERED: 1. The Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (Doc. 4) is ADOPTED and CONFIRMED as the opinion of this Court. 2. Plaintiffs Application to Proceed in District Court Without Prepaying Fees or Costs (Long Form) (Doc. 2) is DENIED. 3.

The Complaint (Doc. 1) is DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE. 4. The Clerk is directed to terminate any other pending motions and close this case. DONE and ORDERED in Jacksonville, Florida on February 9, 2026. JORDAN E. PRATT UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE Copies: Pro Se Party -3-