

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
NEW YORK**

Jessica Yager v. United Access LLC; United Access LLC v. Jeff Curts

Yager · No. 26-CV-511 (JLS) (JJM) · Decided June 16, 2026

OPINION

JESSICA YAGER v. UNITED ACCESS LLC; UNITED ACCESS LLC v. JEFF CURTS

PER CURIAM.

SAIES DISTRICF

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK Sy

JUN 16 2026

JESSICA YAGER,

Plaintiff,

Vv. 26-CV-511 (JLS) (JJM)

UNITED ACCESS LLC,

Defendant/Third Party Plaintiff, v.

JEFF CURTS,

Third Party Defendant.

DECISION AND ORDER

Pro se Plaintiff commenced this action on February 3, 2026, alleging hostile work environment, retaliation, and constructive discharge in violation of state and federal law. See Dkt. 1-1 at 6-9.1 Defendant United Access LLC removed the action to this Court on March 18, 2026. See Dkt. 1. The case has been referred to United States Magistrate Judge Jeremiah J. McCarthy for all proceedings under 28 U.S.C. §§ 636(b)(1)(A), (B), and (C). Dkt. 5. 1 Page numbers refer to the CM/ECF generated numbering in the header of each page. On April 15, 2026, Judge McCarthy issued a Report, Recommendation, and Order that, among other things, ordered the parties to show cause why Plaintiff should not be sanctioned pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 11@)(8) for repeatedly telling the Court—including under penalty of perjury—that her Complaint did not mention federal statutes, when it did. Dkt. 14. Plaintiff and Defendants responded. See Dkt. 21-23 and 34-35. On May 26, 2026, Judge McCarthy issued a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) recommending that Plaintiff not be sanctioned at this time. Dkt. 36 at 1. Neither party filed objections, and the time to do so has expired. See *id.* at 6. 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)(8). 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)(8). But neither 28 U.S.C. § 636 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 McCarthy's recommendation. Accordingly, for the reasons in the R&R, sanctions will not be imposed upon Plaintiff at this time. The case is referred back to Judge McCarthy consistent with the referral order at Dkt. 5.

SO ORDERED. □

Dated: June 16, 2026 — Buffalo, New York / fo / yer 4 JOHN LrSINATRA, JR.

Ny STATES DISTRICT JUD