

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING OFFICER

July 17, 2024

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
Complainant,)	
)	
v.)	8 U.S.C. § 1324a Proceeding
)	OCAHO Case No. 2024A00015
)	
ZARCO HOTELS INCORPORATED,)	
Respondent.)	
)	

Appearances: Jodie Cohen, Esq., for Complainant
Kian Zarrinnam, pro se Respondent

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

This matter arises under the employer sanctions provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended by the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA), 8 U.S.C. § 1324a. Complainant, the United States Department of Homeland Security, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, filed a complaint with the Office of the Chief Administrative Hearing Officer (OCAHO) against Respondent, Zarco Hotels Incorporated, on November 9, 2023. Respondent filed an answer to the Complaint on December 26, 2023.

On June 25, 2024, Respondent filed a Motion for Summary Decision. On July 3, 2024, Complainant filed a Motion for Extension of Time to Reply to Respondent’s Motion for Summary Decision. Complainant cites Counsel’s limited availability during the response period and the length of Respondent’s motion as good cause for an extension of the 10-day regulatory deadline. Mot. Extension 1.

“OCAHO’s Rule of Practice and Procedure for Administrative Hearings do not provide specific standards for granting extensions, but the standard routinely applied is good cause.” *US Tech Workers et al. v. Walgreens*, 19 OCAHO no. 1541, 2 (2024) (quoting *United States v. Space Expl. Techs.*, 18 OCAHO no. 1499, 5 (2023)) (internal quotations omitted).¹ “Good cause requires ‘a

¹ Citations to OCAHO precedents in bound volumes one through eight include the volume and case number of the particular decision followed by the specific page in the bound volume where

demonstration of good faith on the part of the party seeking an enlargement of time and some reasonable basis for noncompliance within the time specified in the rules.” *Lowden v. Ann Arbor Elec. JATC Training Ctr.*, 18 OCAHO no. 1490, 2 (2023) (quoting *Tingling v. City of Richmond*, 13 OCAHO no. 1324c, 2 (2021)).

In granting the Complainant’s motion, the Court considered the following: the request was made shortly after the Respondent’s motion was filed; the proffered rationale is reasonable; and the extension was unopposed. *See, e.g., Space Expl. Techs.*, 18 OCAHO no. 1499, at 7 (finding good cause for an extension, citing lack of prejudice, the short length of time requested, the fact that it was the first extension request, and the fact that the extension was agreed). Complainant’s response to Respondent’s Motion for Summary Decision is due no later than September 30, 2024.

SO ORDERED.

Dated and entered July 17, 2024.

Honorable Andrea R. Carroll-Tipton
Administrative Law Judge

the decision begins; the pinpoint citations which follow are to the pages, seriatim, of the specific entire volume. Pinpoint citations to OCAHO precedents after volume eight, where the decision has not yet been reprinted in a bound volume, are to pages within the original issuances; the beginning page number of an unbound case will always be 1 and is accordingly omitted from the citation. Published decisions may be accessed through the Westlaw database “FIM OCAHO,” the LexisNexis database “OCAHO,” and on the United States Department of Justice’s website: <https://www.justice.gov/eoir/office-of-the-chief-administrative-hearing-officer-decisions>.