

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

May 12, 2025

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
Complainant,)	
)	
v.)	8 U.S.C. § 1324a Proceeding
)	OCAHO Case No. 2023A00054
)	
PASQUEL HERMANOS, INC.,)	
Respondent.)	
)	

Appearances: Christopher Ford, Esq., for Complainant
Guillermo G. Alarcon, Esq., for Respondent

ORDER ACCEPTING AMENDED MOTION FOR SUMMARY DECISION

This case arises under the employer sanctions provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), as amended, 8 U.S.C. § 1324a.

On January 17, 2024, Complainant filed a Motion for Summary Decision, to which it attached exhibits which gave rise to an Order of Inquiry. *United States v. Pasquel Hermanos, Inc.*, 18 OCAHO no. 1506d (2025).¹

On April 28, 2025, Complainant (timely) submitted a Response to OCAHO’s Order Regarding Contents of Prior Filing. Complainant explained the exhibits were attached “erroneously,” and it moved the Court to accept an Amended Motion for Summary Decision (wherein it removed the “erroneously” included pages). Resp. Order 1-2.

¹ 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 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 in the Westlaw database “FIMOCAHO,” or in the LexisNexis database “OCAHO,” or on the website at <https://www.justice.gov/eoir/office-of-the-chief-administrative-hearing-officer-decisions>.

While the attorney now appearing on behalf of the Complainant is not the attorney who sought to “erroneously” include matters potentially containing confidential settlement material in the record, the Court must nevertheless use this opportunity to strongly impress upon DHS counsel (including supervisory attorneys) the importance of carefully checking filings in advance of submission.

The Court GRANTS Complainant’s motion and ACCEPTS the Amended Motion for Summary Decision. Based on the change (removal of two pages in the last exhibit), the Court finds Respondent is not prejudiced by its acceptance of the amendment. Additionally, the Court notes Respondent had the opportunity to opine on their original inclusion (and declined to do so).

SO ORDERED.

Dated and entered on May 12, 2025.

Honorable Andrea R. Carroll-Tipton
Administrative Law Judge