

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PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; precedential status not stated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)