

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	
	)	
Complainant,	)	
	)	8 U.S.C. § 1324a Proceeding
v.	)	
	)	OCAHO Case No. 2026A00011
ROAD MASTERS IG, LLC,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	
_____	)	

Appearances: Hazel L. Gauthier, Esq., for Complainant
Road Masters IG, LLC, Respondent

NOTICE AND ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

This case arises under the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), as amended by the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, 8 U.S.C. § 1324a. Complainant, the United States Department of Homeland Security (DHS), Immigration and Customs Enforcement, filed a complaint with the Office of the Chief Administrative Hearing Officer (OCAHO) on December 23, 2025. Complainant alleges that Respondent, Road Masters IG, LLC, failed to ensure that the employee properly completed section 1 and/or failed to properly complete section 2 or 3 of the Employment Eligibility Verification Form (Form I-9) for two employees (Count I), in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1324a(a)(1)(B). Compl. ¶ 3.

Complainant attached to the complaint the Notice of Intent to Fine Pursuant to Section 274A of the INA (NIF) that it personally served on Respondent on September 26, 2023, at Complainant's office in El Paso, Texas, through Mr. Isaac Garcia, who was identified as the business owner. Compl. Ex. A. Through the NIF, DHS sought a fine of \$3,402 for Respondent's alleged violations. *Id.* The NIF put Respondent on notice of its right to contest the fine by submitting a written request for a hearing before an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) to DHS "within 30 days from

the service of this [NIF].” *Id.* Also attached to the complaint was an undated letter signed by Mr. Isaac Garcia in which he stated that he “wish[ed] to contest the fine listed and respectfully wish[ed] not [to] respond to each allegation listed in the notice until a hearing is conveyed” (“request for hearing”).¹ Compl. Ex. B. The letter was stamped “received” by DHS in El Paso, Texas, on October 20, 2023. *Id.*

Pursuant to 28 C.F.R. § 68.7(b)(5),² Complainant asked OCAHO to serve the complaint on Respondent at a business address in Canutillo, Texas, through Mr. Garcia. Compl. 6.

On January 5, 2026, using the United States Postal Service’s (USPS) certified mail service, OCAHO mailed Respondent a Notice of Case Assignment for Complaint Alleging Unlawful Employment (NOCA), the complaint, the NIF, and Respondent’s request for hearing (together, the “Complaint package”). Through the NOCA, OCAHO’s Deputy Chief Administrative Hearing Officer (Deputy CAHO) informed Respondent that these proceedings would be governed by OCAHO’s Rules of Practice and Procedure for Administrative Hearings and applicable case law. Notice of Case Assignment ¶ 2. The NOCA included links to OCAHO’s Rules and its Practice Manual, along with contact information for OCAHO. *Id.* The Deputy CAHO directed Respondent to answer the complaint within thirty days in accordance with 28 C.F.R. § 68.9(a). *Id.* at ¶ 4. The Deputy CAHO cautioned Respondent that its failure to file an answer could lead the Court to enter a judgment by default and all appropriate relief pursuant to 28 C.F.R. § 68.9(b). *Id.*

Per its standard practice, OCAHO requested a tracking number for the Complaint package and proof of service through a USPS Domestic Return Receipt Form (PS Form 3811) (“return receipt”). The USPS certified mail tracking information for the Complaint package mailed to the Respondent-business indicated that it was “delivered to an individual” at the Canutillo, Texas, address on January 12, 2026. OCAHO did not receive a return receipt for the delivery. To date, Respondent has not filed an answer or communicated with OCAHO.

¹ Should Respondent retain counsel in this matter, its counsel shall file a notice of appearance in accordance with 28 C.F.R. § 68.33(f).

² OCAHO’s Rules of Practice and Procedure for Administrative Hearings, being the provisions contained in 28 C.F.R. part 68 (2025), generally govern these proceedings and are available on the United States Department of Justice’s website. See <https://www.justice.gov/eoir/office-of-the-chief-administrative-hearing-officer-regulations>.

II. REGULATORY AND LEGAL STANDARDS

OCAHO's Rules of Practice and Procedure for Administrative Hearings generally govern these proceedings. OCAHO's Rules explain that the filing of a complaint commences an adjudicatory proceeding before OCAHO. 28 C.F.R. § 68.2. However, "the formal stage of a case actually does not begin (the time deadlines do not start) until the OCAHO serves the original complaint on the respondent employer." *United States v. Arnold*, 1 OCAHO no. 119, 781, 785 (1989) (internal citations omitted).³

OCAHO's Rules require the complainant to identify "the party or parties to be served by the Office of the Chief Administrative Hearing Officer with notice of the complaint pursuant to [28 C.F.R.] § 68.3." 28 C.F.R. § 68.7(b)(5). Complainant must include this information in a statement accompanying the complaint. *Id.* After receiving this information, OCAHO will serve the complaint through one of the following methods:

- (1) By delivering a copy to the individual party, partner of a party, officer of a corporate party, registered agent for service of process of a corporate party, or attorney or representative of record of a party;
- (2) By leaving a copy at the principal office, place of business, or residence of a party; or
- (3) By mailing to the last known address of such individual, partner, officer, or attorney or representative of record.

³ 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 after 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 "FIM-OCAHO," the LexisNexis database "OCAHO," or on OCAHO's homepage on the United States Department of Justice's website at <https://www.justice.gov/eoir/office-of-the-chief-administrative-hearing-officer-decisions>.

Id. § 68.3(a)(1–3). Whichever method is chosen, “[s]ervice of [the] complaint . . . is complete upon receipt by [the] addressee.” *Id.* § 68.3(b).

III. DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

The Court first addresses the question of service of the Complaint package on Respondent. Using the address provided by Complainant, OCAHO sent—via the USPS certified mail—the Complaint package to Respondent at its business address to the attention of its owner Mr. Garcia. Although no return receipt was received, the USPS tracking information reflects that the Complaint package was “delivered to an individual at the address” for the Respondent business on January 12, 2026. The Court therefore finds that OCAHO perfected service of the Complaint package on Respondent on January 12, 2026, in accordance with 28 C.F.R. §§ 68.3(a)(3), 68.3(b).

After service of the complaint, OCAHO’s Rules of Practice and Procedure for Administrative Hearings afford a respondent thirty days to file an answer. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 68.9(a). Through the NOCA, the Deputy CAHO explained this requirement to Respondent. *See* Notice of Case Assignment ¶ 4. Given that service of the complaint was perfected on January 12, 2026, the Court finds that Respondent’s answer was due no later than February 11, 2026. *See* 28 C.F.R. §§ 68.3(b), 68.9(a). Respondent, however, failed to file an answer to the complaint and has not contacted OCAHO regarding this case.

In the NOCA, the Deputy CAHO warned Respondent that if it failed to file a timely answer, the Court might deem it to have waived its right to appear and contest the allegations of the complaint and that a judgment by default and other appropriate relief that might follow. *See* Notice of Case Assignment ¶ 4 (citing 28 C.F.R. § 68.9(b)). “If a default judgment is entered, the request for hearing is dismissed, AND judgment is entered for the complainant without a hearing.” *Nickman v. Mesa Air Grp.*, 9 OCAHO no. 1106, 1 (2004). OCAHO’s long-established practice has been to issue an order to show cause before entering a default. *See United States v. Shine Auto Serv.*, 1 OCAHO no. 70, 444 (1989). In *Shine Auto Service*, the acting CAHO explained:

Respondent must justify [in its response to the order to show cause] its failure to respond in a timely manner. Based on the Respondent’s reply, the [ALJ] shall determine whether the respondent has met the threshold for good cause. If the [ALJ] determines that the Respondent possessed the requisite good cause for failing to file a timely answer, then the [ALJ] may allow the Respondent to file a late answer.

Id. at 445–46. This Court follows the same practice here and now issues this Notice and Order to Show Cause.⁴

The Court orders Respondent to file a response to this Notice and Order to Show Cause in which it must proffer facts sufficient to show good cause for its failure to file a timely answer to the complaint. Additionally, the Court orders Respondent to file an answer to the complaint simultaneously with the filing of its response showing good cause. Respondent’s answer must comport with 28 C.F.R. § 68.9. Upon receipt of Respondent’s filings, the Court will determine if Respondent has demonstrated the requisite good cause for failing to file a timely answer to the complaint and will decide whether to allow its untimely answer.

If Respondent fails to file an answer and a response, the Court may find that Respondent has waived its right to appear and contest the allegations of the complaint. 28 C.F.R. § 68.9(b). The Court may then enter a default judgment. *Id.*

If Respondent fails to respond to the Court’s orders, the Court will find that it has abandoned its request for hearing and dismiss its request pursuant to 28 C.F.R. § 68.37(b)(1). *See, e.g., United States v. Steidle Lawn & Landscape, LLC*, 17 OCAHO no. 1457c, 2 (2023) (finding that the respondent abandoned its request for a hearing when it failed to respond to the ALJ’s orders). “A final order of dismissal based on abandonment is analogous to entry of a default judgment under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.” *United States v. Vilardo Vineyards*, 11 OCAHO no. 1248, 4 (2015). “Abandonment will result in DHS’s NIF becoming the final order.” *United States v. DJ’s Trans.*, 18 OCAHO no. 1488a, 5 (2024).

IV. ORDERS

IT IS ORDERED that, within twenty-one days of the date of this Order, Respondent, Road Master IG, LLC, shall file a response with the Court in which it must provide facts sufficient to show good cause for its failure to timely answer the complaint in this case.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, within twenty-one days of the date of this Order, Respondent shall file with the Court an answer to the complaint that comports with 28 C.F.R. § 68.9.

⁴ OCAHO shall serve this Notice and Order to Show Cause on Respondent at the address Complainant provided in the complaint. *See* Compl. 6.

The Court puts Respondent on notice that its failure to file an answer and a response to this Notice and Order to Show Cause “may be deemed to constitute a waiver of his or her right to appear and contest the allegations of the complaint” and the Court may enter a default judgment against Respondent as to both liability and penalties. 28 C.F.R. § 68.9(b). If Respondent fails to respond to the Court’s orders, the Court shall conclude that Respondent has abandoned its request for a hearing and issue an order of dismissal. *Id.* § 68.37(b). The NIF will be rendered the final agency order.

SO ORDERED.

Dated February 19, 2026

Honorable Carol A. Bell
Acting Chief Administrative Law Judge