

ZAJI OBATALA ZAJRADHARA,
 Complainant,
 v.
 COSTA WORLD CORPORATION,
 Respondent.

)
)
) 8 U.S.C. § 1324b Proceeding
) OCAHO Case No. 2024B00011
)
)
)
)
)

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO RECONSIDER

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>.

May 14, 2025, and May 17, 2025. The second and third filings (based on the titles), were attempts to correct and add additional material to the original filing. Because the filings were not required and were not motions, the filings were all rejected.

On May 29, 2025, Complainant filed a Motion to Reconsider Rejection of Filings, Complete the Case Record, and Expedite Resolution. Complainant argues that the Court's Order Rejecting Complainant's Filings "ignores [the filings'] substantive importance" and that the filings "contain critical evidence" of "visa fraud." Mot. Reconsider 1-2.²

II. DISCUSSION

"OCAHO's Rules of Practice and Procedure do not contemplate motions for reconsideration of interlocutory orders," but the Court may turn to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for guidance. *A.S. v. Amazon Web Servs.*, 14 OCAHO no. 1381l, 5 (2021); 28 C.F.R. § 68.1.³ "The 'power to modify an interlocutory order is authorized by . . . Federal Rule 54(b).'" *Zajradhara v. LBC Mabuhay (Saipan) Inc.*, 16 OCAHO no. 1423d, 4 (2023) (quoting *United States v. Rose Acre Farms, Inc.*, 12 OCAHO no. 1285a, 1 n.1 (2018)). "Reconsideration is an 'extraordinary remedy, to be used sparingly in the interests of finality and conservation of judicial resources.'" *Sharma v. NVIDIA Corp.*, 17 OCAHO no. 1450g, 3 (2023) (quoting *Adidas Am., Inc., v. Payless Shoesource, Inc.*, 540 F.Supp. 2d 1176, 1179 (D. Or. 2008)).

"[R]econsideration is warranted where:

- (1) material differences in fact or law from that presented to the Court and, at the time of the Court's decision, the party moving for reconsideration could not have known of the factual or legal differences through reasonable diligence;
- (2) new material facts that happened after the Court's decision;
- (3) a change in the law that was decided or enacted after the Court's decision; or
- (4) the movant makes a convincing showing that the Court failed to consider material facts that were presented to the Court before the Court's decision.

Zajradhara v. Manbin Corp., 19 OCAHO no. 1553f, 3 (2025) (citing *Sharma*, 17 OCAHO no. 1450g, at 3)).

² Complainant's filing refers to the Order Rejecting Complainant's Filing as its May 13, 2025 Order, but the Order was issued on May 20, 2025.

³ OCAHO Rules of Practice and Procedure, 28 C.F.R. pt. 68 (2024). The rules are also available through OCAHO's webpage on the United States Department of Justice's website. See <https://www.justice.gov/eoir/office-of-the-chief-administrative-hearing-officer-regulations>.

Here, none of the traditional grounds for reconsideration exist. Complainant cites no new material facts and no change of law.

Complainant should be aware that, to the extent he has also attached the contents of these filings to his Motion for Summary Decision, those attachments will be considered in conjunction with that Motion.

Complainant's Motion to Reconsider is DENIED.

SO ORDERED.

Dated and entered on June 16, 2025.

Honorable Andrea R. Carroll-Tipton
Administrative Law Judge