

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

July 17, 2025

ZAJI OBATALA ZAJRADHARA,)	
Complainant,)	
)	
v.)	8 U.S.C. § 1324b Proceeding
)	OCAHO Case No. 2024B00013
)	
JIN JOO CORPORATION,)	
Respondent.)	
_____)	

Appearances: Zaji Obatala Zajradhara, pro se Complainant
Stephen O. Nutting, Esq., for Respondent

ORDER DENYING SECOND MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION & NOTICE TO
COMPLAINANT REGARDING FUTURE FILINGS

This case arises under the employment discrimination provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), as amended, 8 U.S.C. § 1324b. On October 17, 2023, Complainant, Zaji Obatala Zajradhara, filed a complaint with the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer (OCAHO) against Respondent, Jin Joo Corporation.

On July 14, 2025, the Court issued an Order Denying Complainant's Motion to Reconsider Dismissal of National Origin Claim and Citizenship Status Claim.

On the same day, Complainant submitted a filing entitled Complainant's Response to Court's Order Denying Reconsideration, Motion for Reconsideration, and Notice of Intent to Appeal. Complainant raised various arguments and requested that the Court reconsider or vacate its July 14, 2025 order.

Relying on the same law and analysis outlined in its July 14, 2025 Order, the Court now DENIES, once more, Complainant's motion. (Complainant, once more, cites no previously unavailable facts or change of law.)

More critically, however, motions to reconsider orders denying motions to reconsider are procedurally illogical. Parties, even pro se parties, do not get a second bite at the apple when it comes to reconsideration. As this Court has previously explained, "[r]econsideration 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)). If parties could endlessly file motions to reconsider orders denying motions to reconsider, finality would never come to pass. This would undoubtedly stymie the progress of cases, and would waste limited judicial resources on issues that have already been resolved.

The Court now places Complainant on notice: any future motions to reconsider orders denying motions to reconsider will be rejected. This includes any “addendum” filings or “supra motions” to such motions.

SO ORDERED.

Dated and entered on July 17, 2025.

Honorable Andrea R. Carroll-Tipton
Administrative Law Judge