

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF  
FLORIDA

Sydney Marie Keefe v. Britt’s Bow Wow Boutique, Inc., and Merri  
Colvard

Keefe · No. 22-62138-CIV-DIMITROULEAS · Decided December 3, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida adopted and approved a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation concerning supplemental costs and attorney’s fees. The court awarded the plaintiff \$383.15 in supplemental costs and \$43,012.50 in supplemental attorney’s fees, granting the fee motion in part and denying it in part.

CASE DETAILS

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| COURT                 | United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida                                                                                                                                                                            |
| WRITING FOR THE COURT | William P. Dimitrouleas                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| JURISDICTION          | United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida                                                                                                                                                                            |
| DECIDED               | December 3, 2025                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| DOCKET                | 22-62138-CIV-DIMITROULEAS                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| DISPOSITION           | other                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| PROCEDURAL POSTURE    | The district court reviewed and adopted a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation concerning the plaintiff’s motions for supplemental costs and supplemental attorney’s fees after the objection period expired without any objections. |
| STANDARD OF REVIEW    | De novo review of the magistrate judge’s report and recommendation and the record.                                                                                                                                                           |
| PRECEDENTIAL VALUE    | unpublished district court order; precedential status not stated                                                                                                                                                                             |

TOPICS

- attorney fees
- costs
- civil procedure
- remedies

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- attorney fees
- costs
- remedies

**QUESTIONS PRESENTED**

1. Whether the district court should adopt and approve the magistrate judge’s report and recommendation when no timely objections were filed.
2. Whether the plaintiff was entitled to supplemental costs and supplemental attorney’s fees in the amounts recommended by the magistrate judge.

**HOLDINGS**

1. The district court adopted and approved the magistrate judge’s report and recommendation after conducting a de novo review of the report and record, with no timely objections having been filed.
2. The plaintiff was awarded \$383.15 in supplemental costs.
3. The plaintiff’s supplemental motion for attorney’s fees was granted in part and denied in part, and the plaintiff was awarded \$43,012.50 in attorney’s fees.

**FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

The plaintiff sought supplemental costs and supplemental attorney’s fees. The magistrate judge issued a report and recommendation addressing those requests, and no party filed timely objections. The district court adopted the report’s factual findings and agreed with its analysis and conclusions.

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

Magistrate Judge Augustin-Birch issued a Report and Recommendation on November 17, 2025. No timely objections were filed. The district court conducted a de novo review of the report and record, adopted and approved the report, granted the motion for supplemental costs, and granted in part and denied in part the supplemental motion for attorney’s fees.

**DISPOSITION**

other

**CASES CITED**

- LoConte v. Dugger, 847 F.2d 745, 749-50 (11th Cir. 1988)
- LoConte v. Dugger, 488 U.S. 958 (1988) (cert. denied)
- RTC v. Hallmark Builders, Inc., 996 F.2d 1144, 1149 (11th Cir. 1993)

**OPINION**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA CASE NO. 22-62138-CIV-DIMITROULEAS SYDNEY MARIE KEEFE, Plaintiff, vs. BRITT’s BOW WOW BOUTIQUE, INC., and MERRI COLVARD, Defendants.  
\_\_\_\_\_/ ORDER ADOPTING AND APPROVING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE; GRANTING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION

FOR SUPPLEMENTAL COSTS GRANTING IN PART SUPPLEMENTAL MOTION FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES THIS CAUSE is before the Court upon the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Augustin-Birch (the "Report") [DE 184], issued on November 17, 2025, and Plaintiff's Motion for Supplemental Costs and Plaintiff's Verified Motion for Supplemental Attorney's Fees [DE's 177, 181].

The Court notes that no objections to the Report [DE 184] have been filed, and the time for filing such objections has passed. As no timely objections were filed, the Magistrate Judge's factual findings in the Report [DE 184] are hereby adopted and deemed incorporated into this opinion. *LoConte v. Dugger*, 847 F.2d 745, 749-50 (11th Cir. 1988), cert. denied, 488 U.S. 958 (1988); *RTC v. Hallmark Builders, Inc.*, 996 F.2d 1144, 1149 (11th Cir.

1993). Although no timely objections were filed, the Court has conducted a de novo review of the Report [DE 184] and record and is otherwise fully advised in the premises. The Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge's analysis and conclusions.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED AND ADJUDGED as follows: 1. The Report [DE 184] is hereby ADOPTED and APPROVED; 2. Plaintiff's Motion for Supplemental Costs [DE 177] is GRANTED. Plaintiff is hereby awarded \$383.15 in costs. 3. Plaintiff's Motion for Supplemental Attorney's Fees [DE 181] is GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART. Plaintiff is hereby awarded \$43,012.50 in attorney's fees.

DONE and ORDERED in Chambers in Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Florida, on this 2nd day of December, 2025. Df cbf. 4 ii As j if fas ae? A VILLIAM P. DIMITROULEAS United States District Judge Copies furnished to: Counsel of record Magistrate Judge Augustin-Birch