

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.

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