

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
JACKSONVILLE DIVISION**

PRECISION ROOFING OF N.
FLORIDA, INC., individually and
on behalf of all others similarly
situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Case No.: 3:20-cv-352-BJD-LLL

CENTERSTATE BANK,

Defendant.

ANGELA DENISE GRANT,
individually and on behalf of all others
similarly situated,

Plaintiff

v.

Case No.: 8:20-cv-1920-BJD-AAS
(Administratively Closed)

CENTERSTATE BANK,

Defendant.

ORDER

THIS CAUSE is before the Court on the Report and Recommendation (Doc. 76; Report), entered by the Honorable Laura Lothman Lambert, United States Magistrate Judge on April 6, 2023. In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the Court grant Plaintiffs' Unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Settlement and for Certification of Settlement

Class (Doc. 72). Report at 18. No party filed an objection to the Report and the time to do so has passed. The parties did however, file a Joint Notice of Non-Objection to Report and Recommendation (Doc. 77; Notice). Accordingly, the matter is ripe for review.

The Court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). If no specific objections to findings of fact are filed, the district judge is not required to conduct a *de novo* review of those findings. See Garvey v. Vaughn, 993 F.2d 776, 779 n.9 (11th Cir. 1993); see also 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Further, if no objections to a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation are filed, the district court reviews legal conclusions only for plain error and only if necessary in the interests of justice. Shepherd v. Wilson, 663 F. App’x 813, 816 (11th Cir. 2016); see also Mitchell v. United States, 612 F. App’x 542, 545 (11th Cir. 2015) (noting that under 11th Circuit Rule 3-1, the appellant would have waived his ability to object to the district court’s final order on a report and recommendation where appellant failed to object to that report and recommendation). “Under plain error review, we can correct an error only when (1) an error has occurred, (2) the error was plain, (3) the error affected substantial rights, and (4) the error seriously affects the fairness, integrity or public reputation of judicial proceedings.” Symonette v. V.A. Leasing Corp., 648 F. App’x 787, 790 (11th Cir. 2016) (citing Farley v. Nationwide Mut. Ins.

Co., 197 F.3d 1322, 1329 (11th Cir. 1999)). Upon independent review of the entire record, the undersigned finds no plain error in the Report.

Accordingly, it is hereby


ORDERED:

1. The Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (Doc. 76) is **ADOPTED** as the opinion of this Court.

2. Plaintiffs' Unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Settlement and for Certification of Settlement Class (Doc. 72) is **GRANTED**.

3. The Court will adopt the final approval schedule in the proposed order (Doc. 72-3 at 14-15) and enter the proposed order (Doc. 72-3) that 1) conditionally approves the settlement classes; 2) preliminarily approves the class action settlement; 3) approves the notice plan; 4) appoints class counsel and 5) sets a final approval hearing.

DONE AND ORDERED in Jacksonville, Florida, this 26th day of June, 2023.



BRIAN J. DAVIS
United States District Judge

Copies furnished to:

Honorable Laura Lothman Lambert
United States Magistrate Judge

Counsel of Record

ap