

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

J. David John v. Megan Marie Bolinder, et al.

John v. Bolinder · No. 25-CV-23480-GAYLES/D'ANGELO · Decided February 19, 2026

OPINION

John

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

CASE NO.: 25-CV-23480-GAYLES/D'ANGELO

J. DAVID JOHN,

Plaintiff, v. MEGAN MARIE BOLINDER, et al., Defendants.

ORDER

THIS CAUSE comes before the Court on the Omnibus Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Ellen F. D'Angelo (the "Report"). [ECF No. 43]. On August 7, 2025, this Court referred the case to Judge D'Angelo for a ruling on all pretrial non-dispositive matters and a report and recommendation on all dispositive matters. [ECF No. 15]. Defendant Megan Bolinder ("Defendant Bolinder") subsequently filed a Motion to Designate Plaintiff a Vexatious Litigant [ECF No. 27] and a Motion for Attorney's Fees [ECF No. 32]. On February 2, 2026, Judge D'Angelo issued her Report recommending that the Motion to Designate Plaintiff a Vexatious Litigant be denied and that the Motion for Attorney's Fees be granted in part. [ECF No. 43]. Plaintiff timely objected to the Report. [ECF No. 44]. 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). After conducting a de novo review of the record, the Court agrees with Judge D'Angelo's well-reasoned analysis and conclusions that the Motion to Designate Plaintiff as a Vexatious Litigant should be denied and that the Motion for Attorney's Fees should be granted in part.

CONCLUSION

Therefore, it is ORDERED AND ADJUDGED as follows:

(1) The Report and Recommendation, [ECF No. 43], is ADOPTED in full.

(2) Defendant Bolinder's Motion to Designate Plaintiff as a Vexatious Litigant, [ECF No. 27], is DENIED.

(3) Defendant Bolinder's Motion for Attorney's Fees, [ECF No. 32], is GRANTED IN PART. Defendant Bolinder shall be awarded \$7,185.20 in reasonable attorney's fees, pursuant to the Court's inherent authority, based on Plaintiffs bad faith in conducting this litigation. DONE AND ORDERED in Chambers at Miami, Florida, this 19th day of February, 2026.

DARRIN P. GAYLES

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE