

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

ZAJI O. ZAJRADHARA,)	
Complainant,)	
)	
)	8 U.S.C. § 1324b Proceeding
v.)	OCAHO Case No. 2025B00010
)	
)	
KANG CORPORATION,)	
Respondent.)	
)	

Appearances: Zaji O. Zajradhara, pro se Complainant
Mark Scoggins, Esq., for Respondent

ORDER OF INQUIRY ON CONSOLIDATION

I. ORDER DIRECTING PARTIES TO PROVIDE BRIEFING ON CONSOLIDATION

This case arises under the antidiscrimination provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), as amended, 8 U.S.C. § 1324b. On October 16, 2024, Complainant Zaji O. Zajradhara, filed a complaint with the Office of the Chief Administrative Hearing Officer (OCAHO) against Respondent Kang Corporation. Complainant also filed a separate complaint against Respondent on November 15, 2023. That case is pending before the undersigned as OCAHO Case no. 2024B00021. Both counsel and the parties for both matters are the same. The Court “is treating the two cases as related cases[.]” Notice of Case Assignment 1 n.1.

The allegations in both complaints filed by Complainant against this Respondent may arise from the same universe of facts, given that the parties are the same and the position title and potentially the minimum qualifications for the position in question may be the same.

The Court now seeks briefing from the parties on their position on consolidation of the cases. The Court ORDERS the parties to provide their position on whether this case, 2025B00010, and the earlier case, 2024B00021, should be consolidated into one matter at this juncture (or at a later time), or to propose alternative means for promoting efficient resolution of these cases. The parties must submit their briefs on consolidate by three weeks from the issuance of this order.

II. ENTERING PARTIES INTO E-FILING PROGRAM

Although the Court “typically only enrolls cases in electronic filing when both parties have filed e-filing registration forms,” it may convert the case to electronic filing barring a written objection from either party when there are “significant delays inherent with mail filing” because of physical distance between the Court and parties. Zajradhara v. Pure Water Corp., 20 OCAHO no. 1548b, 2 (2024); *see also* Nazarenko v. SupportYourApp, Inc., 19 OCAHO no. 1532b, 3-4 (2024).

The parties will have 14 days from the date of this Order to file an objection to the conversion of this case to electronic filing. The Court issues this order by e-mail and mail.

III. MOTION FOR STAY DENIED

On November 26, 2024, Respondent filed a Motion for Stay, requesting a stay pending a decision on Respondent’s motion for summary decision in 2024B0021. Mot. Stay 2. Complainant did not file an opposition. The Court has not yet set any case deadlines, nor opened discovery. *See* Notice of Case Assignment 4 (“The parties should not initiate discovery until the presiding Administrative Law Judge has set a discovery schedule or otherwise authorized the start of discovery.”). There are, therefore, currently no deadlines to stay. The Court declines to set a case schedule at this time, as it first seeks briefing from the parties on consolidation. Consequently, Respondent’s Motion for Stay is therefore DENIED. Following briefing on consolidation, the Respondent is free to re-file such a motion.

SO ORDERED.

Dated and entered on May 2, 2025.

Honorable John A. Henderson
Administrative Law Judge