

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

**SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE  
COMMISSION,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**Case No. 8:20-cv-325-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-Fourth Quarterly Fee Application for Order Awarding Fees and Reimbursement of Costs to Receiver and His Professionals. (Dkt. 1400) 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 October 1, 2025 through December 31, 2025. (Id.) On March 30, 2026, United States Magistrate Judge Natalie Hirt Adams issued a Report and Recommendation, recommending that the Court award the Receiver all fees and reimbursements requested except for the \$910.00

requested for Jared J. Perez, P.A. (Dkt. 1405) 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. 1405), is **CONFIRMED** and

**ADOPTED** as part of this Order.

2. The Receiver's Unopposed Twenty-Fourth Quarterly Fee Application for Order Awarding Fees and Reimbursement of Costs to Receiver and His Professionals, (Dkt. 1400), is **GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART**. The Application is **DENIED** only to the extent that the Court declines to award the \$910.00 requested to Jared J. Perez, P.A. The Application is otherwise **GRANTED**.
3. Fees and costs shall be awarded in the following amounts:
  - a. The Receiver, in the amount of \$38,659.71;
  - b. Burton W. Wiand, P.A., in the amount of \$23,536.00;
  - c. JND, in the amount of \$21,324.93;
  - d. Levun, Goodman, and Cohen, LLP, in the amount of \$121.25;
  - e. PDR, in the amount of \$16,061.25;
  - f. E-Hounds, in the amount of \$7,015.00; and
  - g. Omni, in the amount of \$911.32.

**DONE** and **ORDERED** in Tampa, Florida, this 11th day of May 2026.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
MARY S. SCRIVEN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

**Copies furnished to:**  
Counsel of Record  
Any Unrepresented Person