

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
FLORIDA, TAMPA DIVISION

Sunstream Corporation, Inc. v. Stefan Petrov and Boating World Pro
Shop, LLC

Sunstream · No. 8:24-cv-2424-WFJ-AAS · Decided January 12, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida granted Sunstream Corporation, Inc.'s unopposed motion for attorney's fees after compelling Stefan Petrov and Boating World Pro Shop, LLC, to respond to discovery requests. Applying Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37(a)(5)(A) and the lodestar approach, the court awarded \$2,313.55 in attorney's fees and computerized legal research expenses.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Tampa Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Amanda Arnold Sansone
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Tampa Division
DECIDED	January 12, 2026
DOCKET	8:24-cv-2424-WFJ-AAS
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for an award of attorney's fees and expenses after prevailing on a motion to compel discovery responses. Defendants did not respond to the fee motion, which the court treated as unopposed.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the requested hourly rates, hours expended, declarations, and billing records for reasonableness, applying the lodestar approach.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown

TOPICS

attorney fees

discovery dispute

sanctions

civil procedure

commercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedure

Discovery

Attorney's fees

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Sunstream was entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and expenses under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37(a)(5)(A) after prevailing on its motion to compel.
2. Whether the requested \$2,313.55 in attorney's fees and expenses was reasonable under the lodestar approach.

HOLDINGS

1. Sunstream was entitled to fee shifting under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37(a)(5)(A), because the court had granted its motion to compel and had already determined that an award of reasonable fees was appropriate.
2. The requested hourly rates and hours were reasonable under the lodestar approach, and Sunstream was awarded \$2,313.55, consisting of \$2,167.50 in attorney's fees and \$146.05 in computerized legal-research expenses.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"The starting point in fashioning an award of attorney's fees is to multiply the number of hours reasonably expended by a reasonable hourly rate." (at 2)

"Accordingly, Sunstream's motion for attorney's fees (Doc. 45) is GRANTED. The court orders fee shifting under Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(5)(A), in the amount of \$2,313.55! against the defendants." (at 4)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The court had previously compelled Stefan Petrov and Boating World Pro Shop, LLC to respond to Sunstream's discovery requests after defendants failed to respond to the motion to compel. The prior order authorized an award of reasonable fees and expenses incurred in bringing the motion and directed the parties to confer regarding the amount. Defendants did not respond to Sunstream's attempts to confer or to the subsequent fee motion. Sunstream supported its request with counsel declarations and billing records seeking \$2,167.50 in attorney's fees and \$146.05 in computerized legal-research expenses.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Sunstream moved to compel defendants to respond to discovery requests. After defendants failed to respond to the motion to compel, the court granted it and awarded Sunstream reasonable attorney's fees and expenses under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37(a)(5)(A). The court then ordered the parties to confer regarding the amount, but defendants failed to respond to Sunstream's attempts to confer. Sunstream moved for \$2,313.55 in fees and expenses, and the court granted the motion.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Loranger v. Stierheim, 10 F.3d 776, 781 (11th Cir. 1994)
- Norman v. Housing Authority of the City of Montgomery, 836 F.2d 1292, 1303 (11th Cir. 1988)
- In re Health Insurance Innovations Securities Litigation, No. 8:17-CV-2186-TPB-SPF, 2021 WL 1341881, at *13 (M.D. Fla. Mar. 23, 2021), report and recommendation adopted, No. 8:17-CV-2186-TPB-SPF, 2021 WL 1186838 (M.D. Fla. Mar. 30, 2021)

OPINION

Petrov

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

TAMPA DIVISION

SUNSTREAM CORPORATION, INC.,

Plaintiff, v. Case No.: 8:24-cv-2424-WFJ-AAS STEFAN PETROV and

BOATING WORLD PRO SHOP, LLC,

Defendants. _____/

ORDER

The plaintiff, Sunstream Corporation, Inc. (Sunstream), requests that the court award attorney's fees for \$2,313.55 against the defendants, Stefan Petrov and Boating World Pro Shop, LLC. (Doc. 45). The defendants did not respond, and the time to do so has expired. The motion is treated as unopposed. See Local Rule 3.01(d), M.D. Fla. ("If a party fails to timely respond, the motion is subject to treatment as unopposed.").

I. BACKGROUND

This motion for attorney's fees arises from an order compelling the defendants to respond to Sunstream's discovery requests. (Doc. 45). On October 31, 2025, Sunstream moved to compel the defendants to respond to Sunstream's discovery requests. (Doc. 38). On November 18, 2025, the court ordered the defendants to respond to Sunstream's motion to compel by 1 November 25, 2025, and warned failure to respond would result in the motion being treated as unopposed. (Doc. 42). The defendants did not respond, and the court granted Sunstream's motion to compel. (Doc. 43). The order granting the motion to compel (Doc. 43) awarded Sunstream reasonable attorney's fees and expenses incurred in bringing the motion. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(5)(A) ("If the motion [to compel] is granted . . . the court must . . . require the party or deponent whose conduct necessitated the motion . . . to pay the movant's reasonable expenses incurred in making the motion, including attorney's fees."). The same order directed "[t]he parties must confer and attempt to agree on the reasonable amount of attorney's fees and expenses Sunstream incurred in

relation to [the motion to compel].” (Doc. 43). The defendants failed to respond to Sunstream’s attempts to confer regarding the reasonable amount of attorney’s fees and expenses owed to Sunstream. (Doc. 45). Sunstream now requests that the court award \$2,313.55 in attorney’s fees in connection with Sunstream’s motion to compel. The motion is treated as unopposed because the defendants failed to respond. See Local Rule 3.01(d), M.D. Fla. (“If a party fails to timely respond, the motion is subject to treatment as unopposed.”). 2

II. ANALYSIS

Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(5)(A), the court already has determined that an award of reasonable attorney’s fees is appropriate. As to the amount, the Eleventh Circuit applies the lodestar approach. “The starting point in fashioning an award of attorney’s fees is to multiply the number of hours reasonably expended by a reasonable hourly rate.” *Loranger v. Stierheim*, 10 F.3d 776, 781 (11th Cir. 1994). The moving party bears the burden of establishing the reasonableness of its hourly rate and the number of hours expended. *Norman v. Hous. Auth. of the City Montgomery*, 836 F.2d 1292, 1303 (11th Cir. 1988). In making fee determinations, the court can rely on its expertise regarding the prevailing hourly rates in the marketplace and the number of hours expended. *Id.* The court has reviewed counsel’s declarations and time records. (Doc. 45, pp. 8–10, 13–15). The requested hourly rates and number of hours performed are reasonable. (See Doc. 45, pp. 10, 15). Specifically, the reasonable attorney’s fees incurred relating to Sunstream’s motion to compel are for a total of \$2,167.50, comprising a total of 6.8 hours of work. Sunstream’s lead counsel, Koley Jessen P.C., L.L.O., billed for 4.9 hours of work on the motion compel at the hourly rates of \$560 for John Lingelbach and \$320 for Emily Coffey (a total of \$1,816.00 in attorney’s fees). (Doc. 45, p. 3 10). Upon review of the billing records, both the hours expended and the hourly rates charged are reasonable. In addition, Sunstream’s lead counsel incurred \$146.05 in “computerized legal research” expenses. Because the computerized research expenses are reasonable and were reasonably incurred, Sunstream is awarded \$146.05 in computerized research expenses. See *In re Health Ins. Innovations Sec. Litig.*, No. 8:17-CV-2186-TPB-SPF, 2021 WL 1341881 at *13 (M.D. Fla. Mar. 23, 2021), report and recommendation adopted, No. 8:17-CV-2186-TPB-SPF, 2021 WL 1186838 (M.D. Fla. Mar. 30, 2021) (awarding computerized research expenses because “they were reasonably incurred and necessary to furthering the interests of the Class during the course of the litigation”). Sunstream’s local counsel, Bleakley Bovol Denman & Grace, billed 1.9 hours at the hourly rates of \$325 for Richard Ervin and \$135 per hour for Margaret Getek (a total of \$351.50 in attorney’s fees). (Doc. 45, p. 15). Upon review of the billing records, both the hours expended and the hourly rates charged are reasonable.

III. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Sunstream’s motion for attorney’s fees (Doc. 45) is GRANTED. The court orders fee shifting under Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(5)(A), in 4 the amount of \$2,313.55! against the defendants. ENTERED in Tampa, Florida, on January 12, 2026. Aranda. ☐☐ Sasone_

AMANDA ARNOLD SANSONE

United States Magistrate Judge 1 The breakdown of the total expenses is \$1,816.00 in attorney's fees and \$146.05 in expenses billed by Sunstream's lead counsel, plus \$351.50 billed by Sunstream's local counsel.

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-middle-district-of-florida-tampa-division-united-states-distric/2026/sunstream-corporation-inc-v-stefan-petrov-and-boating-world-rr4bi854>