

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

January 8, 2025

ZAJI ZAJRADHARA,	)	
Complainant,	)	
	)	
	)	
v.	)	8 U.S.C. § 1324b Proceeding
	)	OCAHO Case No. 2025B00011
	)	
VIZION INSURANCE CO. LTD.,	)	
Respondent.	)	
	)	

---

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

This case arises under the antidiscrimination provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, 8 U.S.C. § 1324b. Complainant, Zaji Zajradhara, filed a complaint with the Office of the Chief Administrative Hearing Officer (OCAHO) on October 16, 2024, against Respondent Vizion Insurance Co., Ltd., alleging that Respondent violated 8 U.S.C. § 1324b by discriminating against him based on citizenship status and national origin by failing to hire him. Compl. 8.

On October 29, 2024, the Chief Administrative Hearing Officer (CAHO) sent a Notice of Case Assignment for Complaint Alleging Unfair Immigration-Related Employment Practices and a copy of the Complaint (“complaint package”) by United States Postal Service (USPS) certified mail to an address provided by the Complainant in the Complaint. USPS tracking data shows the Complaint package was delivered and picked up by an individual at the post office on November 8, 2024. OCAHO also received a signed certified mail receipt (PS Form 3811) indicating the date of delivery was November 8, 2024.

The Notice of Case Assignment informed Respondent that it “has the right to file an answer to the complaint” and that this answer “must be filed within thirty (30) days after receipt of the attached complaint . . . .” Notice Case Assignment 3 (citing 28 C.F.R. §§ 68.3(b), 68.9). The CAHO also warned Respondent that if it “fail[ed] to file an answer within the time provided, the Respondent may be deemed to have waived its right to appear and contest the allegations of the complaint, and the Administrative Law Judge may enter a judgment by default along with any and all appropriate relief.” *Id.* (citing 28 C.F.R. § 68.9(b)).

Because Respondent received the Complaint package on November 8, 2024, its answer deadline was December 9, 2024.<sup>1</sup> To date, Respondent has not filed an answer.

“A party that fails to answer a complaint within the time specified is already in default[.]” *United States v. Quickstuff, LLC*, 11 OCAHO no. 1265, 4 (2015) (citation omitted).<sup>2</sup> OCAHO’s regulations authorize the Administrative Law Judge to enter a judgment by default. 28 C.F.R. § 68.9(b). “This means that the default must be excused before the party is permitted to answer.” *Id.* The party must make a showing of good cause before the answer may be accepted. *Id.* (citing *United States v. Medina*, 3 OCAHO no. 485, 882, 889 (1993)). *See also United States v. ALCO Constr., Inc.*, 18 OCAHO no. 1517, 4 (2024) (requiring a showing of good cause for failure to timely file an answer).

The Court therefore ORDERS Respondent, Vizion Insurance, Co., Ltd., to file an answer that satisfies 28 C.F.R. § 68.9(c) within 45 days of the date of this Order. The answer should include (1) “[a] statement that the respondent admits, denies, or does not have and is unable to obtain sufficient information to admit or deny each allegation” and (2) “[a] statement of facts supporting each affirmative defense.” 28 C.F.R. § 68.9(c)(1)–(2).

The Court FURTHER ORDERS Respondent to submit a filing demonstrating good cause for its failure to timely file an answer within 60 days of this Order.

The Court puts Respondent on notice that should Respondent fail to file an answer and submission demonstrating good cause for its failure to timely file an answer, the Court may enter a default judgment against Respondent under 28 C.F.R. § 68.9(b).

SO ORDERED.

Dated and entered on January 8, 2025.

---

Honorable Jean C. King  
Administrative Law Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> This date accounts for the fact that the default answer deadline would have fallen on Sunday, December 8, 2024. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 68.8(a).

<sup>2</sup> Citations to OCAHO precedents reprinted in bound Volumes 1 through 8 reflect the volume number and the case number of the particular decision, followed by the specific page in that volume where the decision begins; the pinpoint citations which follow are thus to the pages, seriatim, of the specific entire volume. Pinpoint citations to OCAHO precedents subsequent to Volume 8, where the decision has not yet 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 in the Westlaw database “FIM-OCAHO,” or in the LexisNexis database “OCAHO,” or on the website at <http://www.justice.gov/eoir/office-of-the-chief-administrative-hearing-officer-decisions>.