UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
JACKSONVILLE DIVISION

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

vs. Case No. 3:14-cv-786-J-34PDB

LANIER LAW, LLC, et al.,

Defendants.
_____/

ORDER

THIS CAUSE is before the Court on the Report and Recommendation (Dkt. No. 239; Report), entered by the Honorable Patricia D. Barksdale, United States Magistrate Judge, on December 8, 2015. In the Report, Magistrate Judge Barksdale recommends that Lanier's Motion for Leave to Reply (Dkt. No. 227) be granted in part and denied in part; Lanier's Motion for Clarification (Dkt. No. 223) be granted in part and denied in part; and the Court find that empanelment of an advisory jury is unwarranted. See Report at 239. No objections to the Report have been filed, and the time for doing so has now passed.

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 court 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). However, the district court must review legal conclusions de novo. See Cooper-Houston v. Southern Ry. Co., 37 F.3d 603, 604 (11th Cir. 1994); United

States v. Rice, No. 2:07-mc-8-FtM-29SPC, 2007 WL 1428615 at *1 (M.D. Fla. May 14, 2007).

Upon independent review of the file and for the reasons stated in the Magistrate Judge's Report, the Court will accept and adopt the legal and factual conclusions recommended by the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, it is hereby

ORDERED:

1. The Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (Dkt. No. 239) is **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the Court.

2. Lanier's Motion for Leave to Reply (Dkt. No. 227) is **GRANTED, in part, and DENIED, in part**.

a. The Motion is **GRANTED** to the extent that the Court considered the substantive arguments made within the Motion.

b. Otherwise, the Motion is **DENIED**.

3. Lanier's Motion for Clarification (Dkt. No. 223) is **GRANTED, in part, and DENIED, in part**.

a. The Motion is **GRANTED** to the extent that the remaining Defendants requested a finding as to whether there is a jury right in this action. The Court finds that there is no right to a trial by jury in this case.

b. Otherwise, the Motion is **DENIED**.

4. The Court sua sponte determines that the empanelment of an advisory jury in this matter is unwarranted.

DONE AND ORDERED at Jacksonville, Florida, this 4th day of January, 2016.

MARCIA MORALES HOWARD
United States District Judge

ja

Copies to:
The Honorable Patricia D. Barksdale
United States Magistrate Judge
Counsel of Record
Pro Se Parties