

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
NEW YORK

**Moneywell Grp LLC v. Titan Trucking LLC, Standard Waste
Services, TESI Inc., Senior Trucking LLC, Titan Environmental
Solutions, and Jeffrey John Rizzo**

No. 25-CV-274 (JLS) (LGF) · No. 25-CV-274 (JLS) (LGF) · Decided January 20, 2026

OPINION

MONEYWELL GRP LLC v. TITAN TRUCKING LLC, STANDARD WASTE SERVICES, TESI
INC., SENIOR TRUCKING LLC, TITAN ENVIRONMENTAL SOLUTIONS, and JEFFREY
JOHN RIZZO

PER CURIAM.

S STATES

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SES □□□

WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK JAN 20 2026

Rei 2EWENGUIA gs MONEYWELL GRP LLC, SLesrepioenuensues og S Plaintiff,

v. 25-CV-274 (JLS) (LGF)

TITAN TRUCKING LLC, STANDARD

WASTE SERVICES, TESI INC.,

SENIOR TRUCKING LLC, TITAN

ENVIRONMENTAL SOLUTIONS, and

JEFFREY JOHN RIZZO

Defendants.

DECISION AND ORDER

Plaintiff commenced this action in New York State court on February 26, 2025, asserting claims based on an alleged breach of contract. See Dkt. 1-1 at 3-7. The case was removed to federal court on March 27, 2025. Dkt. 1. The case has been referred to United States Magistrate Judge Leslie G. Foschio for all proceedings under 28 U.S.C. §§ 636(b)(1)(A), (B), and (C). Dkt. 10. On March 28, 2025, “a request for verification of admission to this court” was sent to Plaintiffs attorney, Isaac Greenfield. Dkt. 13 at 2. On July 11, 2025, because Mr. Greenfield did not respond to this request, Magistrate Judge Foschio issued an order to show cause for why the case “should not be dismissed for lack of representation by an attorney admitted to this court.” Dkt. 12. Mr. Greenfield never responded to this order, either. Dkt. 13 at 2. On December 5, 2025, Judge Foschio issued a Report and Recommendation (R&R) addressing Plaintiffs lack of compliance with the court order. Dkt. 13. He recommends that the action be dismissed for failure to prosecute the case. Id. at 6. Neither party filed objections, and the time to do so has expired. See Dkt. 13 at 7 (specifying that

objections were due fourteen days from receipt). A district court may accept, reject, or modify the findings or recommendations of a magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). A district court must conduct a de novo review of those portions of a magistrate judge's recommendation to which a party objects. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). But neither 28 U.S.C. § 686 nor Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72 requires a district court to review the recommendation of a magistrate judge to which no objections are raised. See *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149-50 (1985). This Court carefully reviewed the R&R and, based on that review, and in the absence of any objections, the Court accepts and adopts Judge Foschio's recommendation. Thus, for the reasons in the R&R, Plaintiffs action is DISMISSED for failure to prosecute. The Clerk of Court shall close this case. SO ORDERED. Dated: January 20, 2026 = ☐ Buffalo, New York

JOHN L. SINATRA, JR. 9

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE