

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

March 13, 2025

VINAY SAINI,)	
Complainant,)	
)	
)	
v.)	8 U.S.C. § 1324b Proceeding
)	OCAHO Case No. 2025B00001
)	
)	
SHERIDAN COMMUNITY HOSPITAL, ET AL.,)	
Respondent.)	
)	

Appearances: Vinay Saini, pro se Complainant
 Sarah J. Millsap, Esq., David A. Calles Smith, Esq., and Kimberly McNulty, Esq.,
 for Respondent

ORDER GRANTING COMPLAINANT’S MOTION TO SUSPEND RESPONSE DEADLINE

On March 13, 2025, Complainant filed a Motion to Extend or Suspend Deadline for Filing Response to Respondents’ Amended Motion to Dismiss (Motion for Extension). As his basis for the extension/suspension, Complainant cites, among other reasons, that his response to the Amended Motion to Dismiss would depend on information he believes Respondents have not yet proffered and which he seeks to obtain through his March 10, 2025, Motion to Compel. Mot. Ext. 1. As a result, he argues that “[f]undamental fairness requires the Court to resolve the discovery dispute before requiring [him] to file his Response.” *Id.* Complainant also notes that Respondents do not oppose the Motion for Extension. *Id.* at 6.

As the motion is unopposed and the Motion to Compel is still pending before the Court, the undersigned finds that good cause exists for the suspension of Complainant’s deadline to submit a response to the Amended Motion to Dismiss until the Court rules on the Motion to Compel. *United States v. Maya del Sol, LLC*, 20 OCAHO no. 1607, 2 (2024)(citing good cause as “the standard routinely applied” for granting extensions). The Court will reset the deadline upon adjudication of the Motion to Compel.

SO ORDERED.

Dated and entered on March 13, 2025.

Honorable Jean C. King
Administrative Law Judge