

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

May 27, 2025

ZAJI OBATALA ZAJRADHARA,)	
Complainant,)	
)	
)	8 U.S.C. § 1324b Proceeding
v.)	OCAHO Case No. 2024B00020
)	
)	
BLOSSOM CORPORATION,)	
Respondent.)	
_____)	

Appearances: Zaji Zajradhara, pro se Complainant
Wei Lin, for Respondent

NOTICE & ORDER – COMPLAINANT REQUEST TO COMPEL DISCOVERY DENIED

On April 18, 2024, the Court issued an Order Setting Case Schedule and General Litigation Order, through which it instructed the parties that they had until July 17, 2024, to conduct discovery related to the claims in this matter.

On May 29, 2024, the Court issued an Order in which it provided additional clarification to parties. Specifically, Complainant filed a copy of discovery requests, but not a motion to compel consistent with 28 C.F.R. § 68.23.¹ *Zajradhara v. Blossom Corp.*, 18 OCAHO no. 1523a, 2 (2024).² Through that Order, the Court explained that should Complainant seek to compel discovery, he must file a motion and that motion must be filed by July 17, 2024. *Id.*

The Court received no discovery-related motions before the deadline.

¹ OCAHO’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, 28 C.F.R. pt. 68 (2024).

² 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 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>.

On January 7, 2025, Complainant filed his response to Respondent's Motion for Summary Decision, which includes two separate requests related to discovery: (1) a request for the Court "to compel the Respondent to disclose internal company documents, emails, and hiring records," and (2) "[s]hould the Respondent prove uncooperative in the discovery process," a request for "permission to file a Motion to Compel cooperation from the Respondent." Resp. 3.

To the extent the Complainant's filing (a response filing) contains discovery-related requests such requests are DENIED for two reasons. First, Complainant cannot embed a motion within a response filing. Second, any motions related to discovery are untimely as the deadline passed five months prior to his submission, and there was no good cause provided by Complainant as to why the request was untimely.

Currently pending before the Court is Respondent's Motion for Summary Decision. The Court will consider the remainder of Complainant's response filing.

SO ORDERED.

Dated and entered on May 27, 2025.

Honorable Andrea R. Carroll-Tipton
Administrative Law Judge