

ZAJI OBATALA ZAJRADHARA,
 Complainant,
 v.
 EFG PACIFIC HOLDINGS, LLC,
 Respondent.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

8 U.S.C. § 1324b Proceeding
 OCAHO Case No. 2024B00107

ORDER GRANTING RESPONDENT'S EXTENSION REQUEST

“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).

¹ 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.

“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 and a summary decision 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 filings must be received by September 21, 2026 to be considered timely filed.

SO ORDERED.

Honorable Andrea R. Carroll-Tipton
Administrative Law Judge