

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
FLORIDA, MIAMI DIVISION**

**Universa Investments L.P. v. Alexander Borodich, an individual, and
Universa Corporation, Ltd.**

Universa Investments · No. 1:18-cv-24286-GAYLES/SHAW-WILDER · Decided March 23, 2026

OPINION

Borodich

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
MIAMI DIVISION

CASE NO.: 1:18-cv-24286-GAYLES/SHAW-WILDER

UNIVERSA INVESTMENTS L.P.,

Plaintiff, v. ALEXANDER BORODICH, an individual,

and UNIVERSA CORPORATION, LTD.,

a foreign company, Defendants. _____/

ORDER

THIS CAUSE comes before the Court on the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Detra Shaw-Wilder (the “Report”) [ECF No. 42] regarding Defendants Alexander Borodich and Universa Corporation Ltd.’s (collectively, “Defendants”) Motion to Vacate Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(4) (“Motion”) [ECF No. 35]. On July 24, 2025, Plaintiff Universa Investments L.P. (“Plaintiff”) filed a Response in Opposition to Defendants’ Motion. [ECF No. 39]. On February 18, 2026, Judge Shaw-Wilder issued her Report recommending that the Motion be granted. [ECF No. 42]. On February 25, 2026, Plaintiff timely objected to the Report (“Objection”). [ECF No. 45]. 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). The Court has conducted a de novo review of the record, including the Report, the Motion, and Plaintiff’s Objection, and agrees with Judge Shaw-Wilder’s well-reasoned analysis and conclusion that the Motion should be granted.

CONCLUSION

Therefore, it is ORDERED AND ADJUDGED as follows:

- (1) Magistrate Judge Shaw-Wilder's Report and Recommendation, [ECF No. 42], is ADOPTED in full;
- (2) Defendants' Motion, [ECF No. 35], is GRANTED;
- (3) The Clerk's Default [ECF No. 13] and the Final Default Judgment [ECF Nos. 19, 20] are hereby vacated.
- (4) Plaintiff shall properly effectuate service on the Defendants within ninety (90) days of this Order. DONE AND ORDERED in Chambers at Miami, Florida, this 20th day of March 2026.

DARRIN P. GAYLES
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE