

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

ROBERT HEATH,)	
Complainant,)	
)	8 U.S.C. § 1324b Proceeding
v.)	
)	OCAHO Case No. 2022B00024
INFOSOFT SOLUTIONS,)	
Respondent.)	
)	

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

This case arises under the antidiscrimination provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), as amended, 8 U.S.C. § 1324b. On February 2, 2022, Complainant, Robert Heath, filed a complaint with the Office of the Chief Administrative Hearing Officer (OCAHO), alleging that Respondent, Infosoft Solutions, violated § 1324b. On March 3, 2022, Respondent timely filed an answer denying all liability.

On August 4, 2022, the Court issued a Notice and Order that disclosed communications by Complainant concerning a health emergency, and provided notice to the parties of Complainant’s apparent death. *See Heath v. Infosoft Sols.*, 16 OCAHO no. 1447, 1 (2022).¹

On March 15, 2023, the Court issued a Notice and Order which took official notice of Complainant’s death and found Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 25 (Rule 25) applicable to these proceedings. *See Heath v. Infosoft Sols.*, 16 OCAHO no. 1447a, 1 (2023). The March 15, 2023 Notice and Order also provided notice to Complainant’s apparent successor in interest. *Id.* at 3.

On May 10, 2023, the Court issued an Order addressing official notice of Complainant’s executor and Rule 25. *See Heath v. Infosoft Sols.*, 16 OCAHO no. 1447b, 1 (2023). Having found that Complainant’s executor had notice of these proceedings, and that neither party had

¹ 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 subsequent to Volume 8, where the decision has not yet 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,” or in the LexisNexis database “OCAHO,” or on the website at <http://www.justice.gov/eoir/OcahoMain/ocahosibpage.htm#PubDecOrders>.

moved for dismissal based on claim extinguishment, the Court started the 90-day period proscribed by Rule 25(a)(1). Id. at 2. The Court observed:

A motion for substitution may be made by any party or by the decedent’s successor or representative. Fed. R. Civ. P. 25(a)(1). If a motion for substitution is not made within 90 days from the date of [the May 10, 2023] Order, this action by Robert Heath (OCAHO Case No. 2022B00024) may be subject to dismissal without prejudice. *See id.*

Id. (internal quotation marks omitted).

The 90-day window proscribed by Rule 25(a)(1) began on May 10, 2023, and closed on August 8, 2023. To date, no person or entity has sought to substitute themselves for the Complainant in this case.

“If the motion [for substitution] is not made within 90 days after service of a statement noting the death, the action by or against the decedent must be dismissed.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 25(a)(1). As the conditions for dismissal under Rule 25(a)(1) are present in this case, Robert Heath’s Complaint against Infosoft Solutions (OCAHO Case No. 2022B00024) is DISMISSED without prejudice. Any pending motions are denied as MOOT.

SO ORDERED.

Dated and entered on August 16, 2023.

Honorable John A. Henderson
Administrative Law Judge

Appeal Information

In accordance with the provisions of 8 U.S.C. § 1324b(g)(1), this Order shall become final upon issuance and service upon the parties, unless, as provided for under the provisions of 8 U.S.C. § 1324b(i), any person aggrieved by such Order files a timely petition for review of that Order 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, and does so no later than 60 days after the entry of such Order. Such a petition must conform to the requirements of Rule 15 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.