

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

Justin Masse v. MSC Cruises, S.A.

Masse · No. 24-61121-CIV-DAMIAN/Strauss · Decided March 25, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida affirmed and adopted the magistrate judge’s report and recommendation concerning the defendant’s motion for costs. The court granted the motion in part and awarded MSC Cruises, S.A. \$1,180.75 in taxable costs under 28 U.S.C. § 1920, plus interest under 28 U.S.C. § 1961.

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA CASE NO. 24-61121-CIV-DAMIAN/Strauss JUSTIN MASSE, Plaintiff, v. MSC CRUISES, S.A., Defendant.
_____/ ORDER AFFIRMING AND ADOPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE’S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION [ECF NO. 45] AND GRANTING IN PART DEFENDANT’S MOTION FOR COSTS [ECF NO. 42] THIS CAUSE is before the Court on the Report and Recommendation on Defendant’s (Re-Filed) Motion for Costs [ECF No. 42] of United States Magistrate Judge Jared M. Strauss, entered on February 13, 2026 [ECF No. 45 (“Report”)].

Judge Strauss recommends that the Court grant in part Defendant’s Motion and award Defendant taxable costs in the amount of \$1,180.75. The parties have not filed objections to the Report, and the time to do so has passed.¹ 1 When no party has timely objected, “the court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face o f the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Fed.

R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s notes (citation omitted). Although Rule 72 itself is silent on the standard of review, the Supreme Court has acknowledged Congress’s intent was to only require a de novo review where objections have been properly filed, not when neither party objects. See *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.”).

THE COURT has reviewed the Report, the Motion,’ and the relevant record and agrees with the reasoning and recommendations set forth therein. Finding no clear error, this Court AFFIRMS and ADOPTS Judge Strauss’s Report [ECF No. 45].

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED AND ADJUDGED as follows: 1. Defendant's Motion for Costs [ECF No. 42] is GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART. 2. Defendant is awarded \$1,180.75 in taxable costs pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1920, plus interest in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1961. DONE AND ORDERED in Chambers in the Southern District of Florida, this 24th day of March, 2026.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE cc: Counsel of record? As noted in the Magistrate Judge's Report, Plaintiff did not file a response to the Motion.