

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

ADITYA SINGH,)	
Complainant,)	
)	
)	8 U.S.C. § 1324b Proceeding
v.)	OCAHO Case No. 2025B00026
)	
)	
HANNAFORD BROS., CO., LLC D/B/A,)	
HANNAFORD STORE 8361,)	
Respondent.)	
)	

Appearances: Vikram Angurala, for Complainant
Kendall Hoechst, Esq., for Respondent

FINAL ORDER OF DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE

On May 7, 2025, the Court referred this matter to OCAHO’s Settlement Officer Program for a period of 60 days, to conclude on July 7, 2025. Singh v. Hannaford Bros., Co., LLC, 21 OCAHO no. 1664a, 1 (2025).¹ In the order making the referral, the Court instructed the parties that “[s]hould [they] reach a settlement, they shall inform the undersigned of such settlement and provide the appropriate filing.” Id. at 2 (citing 28 C.F.R. § 68.14).²

On August 7, 2025, the parties filed a Joint Motion to Dismiss with Prejudice. Through the motion, signed by Complainant and counsel for Respondent, the parties “jointly move to dismiss this matter with prejudice” pursuant to “a full settlement agreement” that “is mutually agreeabl[e].” Joint Mot. Dismiss 1.

OCAHO’s Rules of Practice and Procedure provide for two avenues of dismissal pursuant to a settlement agreement. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 68.14. Relevant here, 28 C.F.R. § 68.14(a)(2) provides

¹ 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>.

² OCAHO’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, 28 C.F.R. part 68 (2024).

that parties shall “[n]otify the Administrative Law Judge that the parties have reached a full settlement and have agreed to dismissal of the action. Dismissal of the action shall be subject to the approval of the Administrative Law Judge, who may require the filing of the settlement agreement.”

Because the parties did not file a copy of their settlement agreement with the Joint Motion to Dismiss with Prejudice, and because Complainant is not represented by counsel, the Court held a status conference with the parties on August 12, 2025 to inquire about the general terms of the settlement agreement and to confirm that Complainant understood the effect of a dismissal with prejudice. Satisfied with the parties’ representations, the undersigned informed the parties of the Court’s intent to grant their Joint Motion to Dismiss with Prejudice, which is now memorialized in this Order.

Accordingly, the parties’ Joint Motion to Dismiss with Prejudice is GRANTED and the complaint is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.

SO ORDERED.

Dated and entered on August 15, 2025.

Honorable John A. Henderson
Administrative Law Judge

Appeal Information

This order shall become the final agency order unless modified, vacated, or remanded by the Attorney General. Provisions governing the Attorney General's review of this order are set forth at 28 C.F.R. pt. 68. Within sixty days of the entry of an Administrative Law Judge's final order, the Attorney General may direct the CAHO to refer any final order to the Attorney General for review, pursuant to 28 C.F.R. § 68.55.

Any person aggrieved by the final order has sixty days from the date of entry of the final order to petition for review in the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the violation is alleged to have occurred or in which the employer resides or transacts business. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1324b(i)(1); 28 C.F.R. § 68.57. A petition for review must conform to the requirements of Rule 15 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.