

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
KENTUCKY

Jeffrey Mador v. Armscor Precision International, also known as
API, et al.

Mador · No. 6:24-cv-146-REW-HAI · Decided December 5, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky adopted a magistrate judge’s recommendation denying Plaintiff Jeffrey Mador’s motion for sanctions and request to extend the discovery deadline. The court noted that neither party objected to the recommendation and concluded that the defendants had not warranted sanctions or an extension.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Robert E. Wier
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky
DECIDED	December 5, 2025
DOCKET	6:24-cv-146-REW-HAI
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for sanctions and an extension of the discovery deadline based on alleged noncompliance with discovery orders. A magistrate judge recommended denial of both requests, and no party objected.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When no party objects to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, the district court is not required to review the magistrate judge's factual or legal conclusions de novo or under any other standard; failure to object generally forfeits further review. Dispositive portions to which a party objects are reviewed de novo under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b)(3).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court order with no reporter citation

TOPICS

sanctions

discovery dispute

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

discovery

sanctions

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's recommendation when neither party filed an objection.
2. Whether plaintiff's motion for sanctions and extension of the discovery deadline should be denied.

HOLDINGS

1. When neither party objects to a magistrate judge's factual or legal conclusions, the district court is not required to conduct de novo or other review of those conclusions, and the failure to object generally forfeits the right to additional review.
2. The motion for sanctions and extension of the discovery deadline is denied.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Given the lack of objection and noting the evident soundness in Judge Ingram’s analysis and conclusions, the Court ADOPTS DE 63 and, consistent with that opinion, DENIES DE 53.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff Jeffrey Mador alleged that Defendants Armscor Precision International and Armscor Global Defense, Inc. failed to comply with the court's discovery orders. He supported a motion for sanctions and an extension of the discovery deadline, and the parties submitted briefing and the full transcript of the deposition underlying the motion. The magistrate judge concluded that both requests should be denied, and neither party objected.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Mador moved for sanctions and to extend the discovery deadline. After briefing and submission of the relevant deposition transcript, Magistrate Judge Hanly A. Ingram recommended denying both requests and allowed fourteen days for objections. No objections were filed, so the district court adopted the recommendation and denied the motion.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Thomas v. Arn, 106 S. Ct. 466, 472 (1985)
- United States v. White, 874 F.3d 490, 495 (6th Cir. 2017)

OPINION

Mador

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY

SOUTHERN DIVISION

LONDON

JEFFREY MADOR,)

) Plaintiff,) No. 6:24-cv-146-REW-HAI) v.)

) ORDER

ARMSCOR PRECISION)

INTERNATIONAL, also known as) API, et al.,)) Defendants.) *** ***) Plaintiff Jeffrey Mador moved for the imposition of sanctions and an extension of the discovery deadline on the ground that Defendants Armscor Precision International and Armscor Global Defense, Inc. did not comply with the Court's Discovery Orders at DE 46 and DE 49. See DE 53 (Motion). The parties fully briefed the matter, see DE 56 (Response), DE 60 (Reply), and provided, per Judge Ingram's Order (DE 61), the full transcript of the deposition underlying the sanctions motion, see DE 62 (Notice of Filing). Judge Ingram recommended denial of both the motion for sanctions and the extension of the discovery deadline. See DE 63 (Recommended Disposition and Order) at 6-7. The Recommended Disposition permitted a 14-day objection period for both issues. See *id.* The objection window has now closed, and neither party objected. While this Court reviews de novo those portions of a dispositive Report and Recommendation to which a party objects, see 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), it is not required to "review . . . a magistrate [judge]'s factual or legal conclusions, under a de novo or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings." *Thomas v. Arn*, 106 S. Ct. 466, 472 (1985); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). Generally, the failure to object forfeits any right to additional review. See, e.g., *United States v. White*, 874 F.3d 490, 495 (6th Cir. 2017) ("When a party . . . fails to lodge a specific objection to a particular aspect of a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, we consider that issue forfeited on appeal."). Given the lack of objection and noting the evident soundness in Judge Ingram's analysis and conclusions, the Court ADOPTS DE 63 and, consistent with that opinion, DENIES DE 53. This the 5th day of December, 2025. ER Signed By: © Robert E. Wier "2a United States District Judge