UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
TAMPA DIVISION

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

v. **Case No. 8:20-cv-00325-MSS-NHA**

BRIAN DAVISON;
BARRY M. RYBICKI;
EQUIALT LLC;
EQUIALT FUND, LLC;
EQUIALT FUND II, LLC;
EQUIALT FUND III, LLC;
EA SIP, LLC;

Defendants, and

128 E. DAVIS BLVD, LLC, et al.,

Relief Defendants.
_____/

ORDER

THIS CAUSE comes before the Court for consideration of the Receiver's Unopposed Twenty-Second Quarterly Fee Application for Order Awarding Fees and Reimbursement of Costs to Receiver and His Professionals. (Dkt. 1356) The Receiver seeks fees and costs for his work and the work of the professionals he retained to assist him in the resolution of this matter for the period from April 1, 2025 through June 30, 2025. (Id.) On August 20, 2025, United States Magistrate Judge Natalie Hirt Adams issued a Report and Recommendation, recommending that the Receiver's Motion be

granted. (Dkt. 1357) No party has filed an objection to the Report and Recommendation, and the deadline to do so has expired.

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, 732 (11th Cir. 1982), cert. denied, 459 U.S. 1112 (1983). A district judge "shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). This requires that the district judge "give fresh consideration to those issues to which specific objection has been made by a party." Jeffrey S. v. State Bd. of Educ., 896 F.2d 507, 512 (11th Cir.1990) (quoting H.R. 1609, 94th Cong. § 2 (1976)). 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. Southern Ry., 37 F.3d 603, 604 (11th Cir. 1994).

Upon consideration of the Report and Recommendation, in conjunction with an independent examination of the file, the Court is of the opinion that the Report and Recommendation should be adopted, confirmed, and approved in all respects. Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that:

1. The Report and Recommendation, (Dkt. 1357), is **CONFIRMED** and

ADOPTED as part of this Order.

2. The Receiver's Unopposed Twenty-Second Quarterly Fee Application for Order Awarding Fees and Reimbursement of Costs to Receiver and His Professionals, (Dkt. 1307), is **GRANTED**.

3. Fees and costs shall be awarded in the following amounts:

   a. The Receiver, in the amount of $48,325.91;

   b. G&P, in the amount of $14,775.00;

   c. JND, in the amount of $17,981.73;

   d. Jared J. Perez, P.A., in the amount of $5,740.00;

   e. Yip Associates, in the amount of $1,274.00;

   f. PDR, in the amount of $16,254.11;

   g. E-Hounds, in the amount of $6,945.00; and

   h. Omni, in the amount of $2,299.61.

DONE and **ORDERED** in Tampa, Florida, this 5th day of September 2025.

MARY S. SCRIVEN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Copies furnished to:
Counsel of Record
Any Unrepresented Person