UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
TAMPA DIVISION

BAIT PRODUCTIONS PTY LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v. Case No. 8:12-cv-2469-T-33TGW

DOES 1-71,

Defendants.
_____/

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on consideration of United States Magistrate Judge David A. Baker's December 14, 2012, Report and Recommendation, in which Judge Baker recommends that all of Bait Productions PYT LTD.'s claims, except those asserted against the respective Doe 1 Defendants be severed and that Bait Productions be ordered to file separate complaints against the other Doe Defendants against whom it wishes to proceed, along with separate filing fees, within 14 days. Judge Baker also recommends that all Bait Production cases in the Middle District (pending and future) be assigned to a single District Judge-Magistrate Judge pair.

Bait Productions filed a timely Objection to the Report and Recommendation. However, upon consideration, the Court overrules the Objection and adopts the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge in part. The Court does not adopt the Report and Recommendation to the extent that it recommends that all present and future Bait

Productions cases be assigned to a single District Judge-Magistrate Judge pair. The Report and Recommendation is adopted in all other respects.

Discussion

After conducting a careful and complete review of the findings and recommendations, a district judge may accept, reject or modify the magistrate judge's report and recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Williams v. Wainwright, 681 F.2d 732 (11th Cir. 1982), cert. denied, 459 U.S. 1112 (1983). In the absence of specific objections, there is no requirement that a district judge review factual findings *de novo*, Garvey v. Vaughn, 993 F.2d 776, 779 n.9 (11th Cir. 1993), and the court may accept, reject or modify, in whole or in part, the findings and recommendations. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). The district judge reviews legal conclusions *de novo*, even in the absence of an objection. See Cooper-Houston v. S. Ry. Co., 37 F.3d 603, 604 (11th Cir. 1994); Castro Bobadilla v. Reno, 826 F. Supp. 1428, 1431-32 (S.D. Fla. 1993), aff'd, 28 F.3d 116 (11th Cir. 1994) (Table).

After conducting a careful and complete review of the findings, conclusions and recommendations, and giving *de novo* review to matters of law, the Court accepts the factual findings and legal conclusions of the Magistrate Judge and the

recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, with the exception noted above.

Accordingly, it is now

ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and **DECREED:**

(1) The Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED** and **ADOPTED** in part.

(2) All claims except those asserted against Doe 1 are **SEVERED** and **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

(3) Bait Productions may re-file separate actions against as many of the Doe Defendants as Bait Productions wishes to pursue, with a new filing fee to be paid as to each Defendant, **WITHIN FOURTEEN DAYS OF THE DATE OF THIS ORDER**.

(4) The Court rejects the recommendation that all Bait Productions cases in the Middle District of Florida (pending and future) be assigned to a single District Judge-Magistrate Judge pair.

DONE and **ORDERED** in Tampa, Florida, this 25th day of January, 2013.

Virginia M. Hernandez Covington

VIRGINIA M. HERNANDEZ COVINGTON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Copies: All Counsel and Parties of Record