

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

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

## ORDER GRANTING RESPONDENT'S EXTENSION REQUEST

On August 7, 2026, Respondent requested an extension to respond to this motion.<sup>2</sup> Respondent anticipates his response to the motion will take a significant amount of time to draft and assemble given the nature of the Complainant’s motion. Additionally, Respondent explains he will be “off-island” and will not be available for that period of time. Respondent requests 30 additional days to assemble and file its Response.

On May 20, 2025, Complainant submitted a filing captioned as Complainant's Motion for Summary Judgment). This filing had four attachments. Based on the caption of the motion, Complainant appears to be asking the Court to consider disposing of the case in his favor based on the factual record as submitted by him (and Respondent in its cross motion). Indeed, when a party moves for summary decision, it is asking the Court to conclude there are no genuine issues of material fact, and there are sufficient facts in the record (or attached to the motion) to make a decision on the merits. In such an instance, the parties are communicating to the Court there is no need to conduct any further discovery. *See* Case Management Order 2-3.

<sup>2</sup> Respondent references a desire for an extension to file responses to other motions in other cases. In order for the Court to consider extension requests related to other motions in other cases, Respondent must file a motion in those cases.

“OCAHO’s Rules of Practice and Procedure for Administrative Hearings do not provide specific standards for granting extensions, but the standard routinely applied is good cause.” *United States v. Space Expl. Techs.*, 18 OCAHO no. 1499, 5 (2023); *see also US Tech Workers Et Al. v. G2*, 19 OCAHO no. 1569, 2 (2024).

“Good cause requires a demonstration of good faith on the part of the party seeking an enlargement of time and some reasonable basis for noncompliance within the time specified in the rules.” *G2*, 19 OCAHO no. 1569, at 2 (quoting *Lowden v. Ann Arbor Elec. JATC Training Ctr.*, 18 OCAHO no. 1490, 2 (2023) (internal quotation marks omitted)).

Respondent has identified a reasonable basis for its request, as its counsel articulated he will be unavailable for a period of time. Further, Respondent’s assessment of the time and effort it will take to provide a response to a discovery-related motion is reasonable. While Respondent seeks only 30 days, the Court will set the deadline to provide a response for September 21, 2026 to account for delays in receipt of this Order and in consideration of the extra time it takes for parties to file from the CNMI.

Respondent’s motion is **GRANTED**, and Respondent’s filing must be received by September 21, 2026 to be considered timely filed.

SO ORDERED.

---

Honorable Andrea R. Carroll-Tipton  
Administrative Law Judge