

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

May 20, 2015

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

No. 14-11291

Summary Calendar

BRIAN PARKER; MICHAEL FRANK; JEREMY COZART; VICTORIA CASTILLO; DANA BLOCK; JOHNNY L. KEEL; JESSICA CASEY; GREGORY A. BURK; VALLERY S. MANN; JO MINAYA; CHRISTOPHER J. PITRE; TIM CARR; JOHN R. NELSON; CODDIE B. DEAN,

Plaintiffs - Appellees

v.

LLOYD WARD P.C., doing business as Lloyd Ward & Associates,

Defendant - Appellant

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Texas
USDC 3:10-CV-1332

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, JONES, and HIGGINSON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Lloyd Ward P.C. appeals the district court's modification of final judgment under Rule 60(a). Ward did not respond to the Rule 60(a) motion below; accordingly, we review only for plain error and find none. *See Ward v. Rhode*, 544 F. App'x 349, 351 (5th Cir. 2013) (unpublished) (citing *Douglass v.*

* Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

No. 14-11291

United Servs. Auto. Ass'n, 79 F.3d 1415, 1428-29 (5th Cir. 1996)). Although the jury awarded fourteen plaintiffs damages in this Fair Labor Standards Act case, the district court's final judgment listed only ten. After learning of this mistake, the district court modified the judgment to include all fourteen plaintiffs. Rule 60(a) explicitly allows district courts to correct these types of transcription errors. *See Rivera v. PNS Stores, Inc.*, 647 F.3d 188, 193-94 (5th Cir. 2011). There is no doubt that the court's mistake was inadvertent because the jury unambiguously found in favor of fourteen plaintiffs and no subsequent order altered the jury's findings. Because the district court did not plainly err, we **AFFIRM**. Appellees' motion for sanctions is **DENIED**.