

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

TRAVIS DARNELL AUSTIN,	)	
Complainant,	)	
	)	
	)	8 U.S.C. § 1324b Proceeding
v.	)	OCAHO Case No. 2023B00009
	)	
SPECIALIZED STAFFING SOLUTIONS, INC.,	)	
Respondent.	)	
	)	

---

Appearances: Travis Austin, pro se Complainant  
Leah Toro, Esq., and Courtney Tedrowe, Esq., for Respondent

ORDER ON RESPONDENT’S MOTION  
TO COMPEL AND AMEND SCHEDULING ORDER

I. BACKGROUND

This case arises under the antidiscrimination provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), as amended, 8 U.S.C. § 1324b. On November 21, 2022, Complainant, Travis Austin, filed a complaint against Specialized Staffing Solutions, Inc. (SSSI). Complainant alleges that SSSI discriminated against him on account of citizenship status and national origin, in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1324b(a)(1); retaliated against him for engaging in § 1324b protected activity, in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1324b(a)(5); and engaged in unfair documentary practices, in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1324b(a)(6).

On April 19, 2023, the Court issued an Order following the March 30, 2023 Prehearing Conference. The Order memorialized the case schedule set by the Court. PHC Order 3. The Court set May 30, 2023, as the close of all discovery (including discovery motions). *Id.*

On May 30, 2023, Respondent filed a Motion to Compel Discovery. In the motion, Respondent moves the Court to compel Complainant’s response as to one Request for Admission and ten Requests for Production of Documents. Mot. Compel Disc. 4. Respondent states that it timely served discovery on Complainant, but that Complainant declined to respond to many of the requests. *Id.* at 2–3. There is no evidence that Complainant objected to any of the discovery requests at issue in this case. In Respondent’s Exhibit 3, which includes Complainant’s First

Response to Requests for Production of Documents and Requests for Admission, Complainant did not present any written response to the Respondent's Request for Production of Documents.<sup>1</sup> With regard to Request for Admission Number 6, Complainant similarly offered no answer or objection.

Respondent also submitted an affidavit of Respondent's counsel attesting to its good faith efforts to meet and confer with the Complainant in advance of filing its motion to compel. Decl. Leah Toro.

Complainant did not file a written opposition, nor did it request an extension of time to do so.<sup>2</sup> The motion is therefore ripe for adjudication.

On October 6, 2023, Respondent filed a Motion to Amend Scheduling Order, requesting that the Court amend the scheduling order by extending the deadline for final prehearing statements and selecting a later date for the hearing. Mot. Amend Scheduling Order 1-3.

## II. DISCOVERY LEGAL STANDARDS

An OCAHO Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) may "compel the production of documents" and compel responses to discovery requests, pursuant to 28 C.F.R. §§ 68.23, 68.28.<sup>3</sup> United States v. Rose Acre Farms, Inc., 12 OCAHO no. 1285, 2 (2016)<sup>4</sup>; *see* Contreras v. Cavco Indus., Inc., 16 OCAHO no. 1440, 2 (2022) (collecting recent OCAHO cases adjudicating motions to compel discovery). A party may file a motion to compel discovery "if the responding party fails to adequately respond or objects to the request." United States v. Tuesday Line, Inc., 16 OCAHO no. 1425a, 2 (2022) (citing 28 C.F.R. § 68.23(a)).

Pursuant to 28 C.F.R. § 68.23(b), a motion to compel must set forth:

---

<sup>1</sup> The Court will refer to the accompanying exhibits by their number and if applicable, tab letter. For example, a reference to the USCIS Form I-9 (Tab E) would be cited as Ex. 3-E.

<sup>2</sup> In an exhibit accompanying the record of the meet and confer, Complainant argued that he was unable to respond to the discovery because "I have lots of things going on which is causing delays in my response. I will do the best I can." Mot. Compel. Ex. 2. As the Court advised during the initial prehearing conference, the appropriate vehicle to seek an amendment of a court-imposed deadline is a motion to the court. Failing that, a party may raise an unforeseen matter which has affected their ability to comply with a court order through a variety of means, including a filed opposition to the motion which explains why the non-moving party was unable to meet the deadline.

<sup>3</sup> OCAHO Rules of Practice and Procedure, 28 C.F.R. pt. 68 (2023).

<sup>4</sup> 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>.

- (1) The nature of the questions or request;
- (2) The response or objections of the party upon whom the request was served;
- (3) Arguments in support of the motion; and
- (4) A certification that the movant has in good faith conferred or attempted to confer with the person or party failing to make the discovery in an effort to secure information or material without action by the Administrative Law Judge.

“Separate from a party’s burden to lodge a timely objection, the Court has independent authority to decline to compel a party’s response to discovery requests.” Contreras, 16 OCAHO no. 1440, at 3 (citing 28 C.F.R. § 68.23).

“Parties generally may obtain discovery regarding any matter not privileged that is relevant to the subject matter involved in the proceeding.” United States v. Durable, Inc., 11 OCAHO no. 1221, 3 (2014) (citing 28 C.F.R. § 68.18(b)). Relevance in discovery “has been construed broadly to encompass any matter that bears on, or that could reasonably lead to other matter that could bear on, an issue that is or may be in the case.” United States v. Autobuses Ejecutivos, LLC, 11 OCAHO no. 1220, 3 (2014) (citations omitted). “The party seeking discovery bears the burden of proof on relevancy.” Heath v. Consultadd, 15 OCAHO no. 1395a, 2 (2022) (citations omitted).

### III. ANALYSIS

#### A. Motion to Compel Requirements

Respondent’s Motion to Compel Discovery complies with 28 C.F.R. § 68.23(b), in that the motion includes a certification of a good faith attempt to meet and confer, copies of the discovery issued, and the matters on which the moving party seeks an order compelling production. Mot. Compel Disc. Exs. 1, 3; *see* § 68.23(b)(1)–(2); Decl. Leah Toro; *see* § 68.23(d); *see also* Mot. Compel Disc. Ex. 3 (correspondence exchanged by the parties about discovery). In that Complainant has offered neither an objection to the discovery, nor a response, the brunt of the analysis concerns the legal sufficiency of the requests rather than the adequacy of the response.

The Court will discuss Request for Admission No. 6 and Request for Production of Documents No. 1–10.

## B. Respondent's Discovery Requests

### Request for Admission

#### 1. Request for Admission No. 6

Request for Admission No. 6 asks Complainant to “[a]dmit you have been issued a social security card by the Social Security Administration of the United States of America.”<sup>5</sup> Mot. Compel Disc. Ex. 1 ¶ 7. Respondent seeks an order compelling a response or an order deeming that the request has been admitted. *Id.* at 4.

The Social Security card is relevant to an allegation in the Complaint that Respondent rejected his “Social Security Number” as an adequate document for I-9 verification. Compl. 2–3, 10. Complainant provided neither an answer nor an objection.<sup>6</sup> *Id.* at 3 ¶ 1–3. In weighing whether to grant the motion, the Court notes that while Complainant is pro se, and that pro se litigants are accorded special solicitude in their familiarity with the rules of civil litigation, in this case the Complainant responded to all requests for admission excluding this one. To the extent this omission was an oversight, Complainant offered no belated explanation for failing to address it. Moreover, the Complainant issued discovery of his own, suggesting some familiarity with the nature of requests for admission and therefore the consequences of failing to answer them. *See* Mot. Compel Disc. Ex. 1 ¶ 4 (citing 28 C.F.R. § 68.21); Mar. 7, 2023 Order 3–4.

Accordingly, the Court will GRANT Respondent’s motion as to Request for Admission No. 6. Further, the Court will deem Request for Admission No. 6 as ADMITTED. *See Moses v. U.S. Steel Corp.*, 946 F. Supp. 2d 834, 841 (N.D. Ind. 2013) (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 36(b)) (finding it appropriate to deem matters admitted when the pro se party did not timely respond to requests for admission or ask for additional time to respond).

### Requests for Production of Documents<sup>7</sup>

As mentioned previously, Complainant provided no written response to the discovery requests. He also produced no discovery. Accordingly, the Court’s analysis is limited to the relevance of the requests for production of documents, whether the discovery is within the Court’s limits, and whether the Court can determine the meaning of the discovery with sufficient clarity to enter an order directing compliance. The Court determines that the Respondent has

---

<sup>5</sup> Respondent did not seek an admission on the genuineness of any Social Security card. Nonetheless, the Court notes that there was no limit on the number of Requests for Admission seeking an admission on the genuineness of a document. *See* Mar. 7, 2023 Order 3 ¶ VI.5 (discovery rules provision of General Litigation Order).

<sup>6</sup> Complainant later provided a copy of a Social Security card for “Travis D. Austin.” Mot. Compel Disc. Ex. 4-D.

<sup>7</sup> For brevity, the Court will refer to each individual request as “Request for Production No. #.” Except where otherwise noted, the Court does not find issue with the requests meeting the procedural requirements of 28 C.F.R. § 68.20.

waived his opportunities to object to the discovery, insofar as he has imposed no objections either in the response to the requests for production or in an opposition to the motion to compel.

The Court additionally notes that during the prehearing conference it limited the parties to 10 interrogatories, 10 requests for production of documents, 10 requests for admission (excluding those related to the authenticity of a document), and 3 depositions. This order, issued pursuant to the Court's inherent power to control the amount and scope of discovery, comports with 28 C.F.R. § 68.16(a) ("the frequency or extent of these methods [of discovery] may be limited by the Administrative Law Judge upon his or her own initiative pursuant to a motion under paragraph (c) of this section."). It also finds support in Rule 26(b)(2)(C) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which directs that the court must impose limits on the amount and scope of discovery upon a determination that the "discovery sought is unreasonably cumulative or duplicative[.]" Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(C).

## 2. Request for Production No. 1

Request for Production No. 1 seeks "all documents identified in [Complainant's] answers" which he used to prepare answers to the Requests for Admission. Mot. Compel Ex. Disc. 1 ¶ 5; *see id.* at Ex. 3 (the answers).

Request for Production No. 1 is relevant because it directly relates to the facts of the case. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 68.18(b). Specifically, these documents bear on how Complainant answered the Requests for Admission. Those requests seek, in sum, information on Complainant's employment relationship with Respondent and "U.S.A. Republic" — issues central to Complainant's § 1324b allegations.

The Court therefore GRANTS Respondent's motion as to Request for Production No. 1. Complainant is ORDERED to provide the documents identified in this request to Respondent. For documents included at Exhibit 4, Complainant may either produce the relevant document, or admit that the document is genuine. *Cf.* 28 C.F.R. § 68.21(a).

## 3. Request for Production No. 2

Request for Production No. 2 demands that Complainant produce "a true and correct copy of [his] social security card." Mot. Compel Ex. 1 ¶ 5.

Request for Production No. 2 is relevant for the same reasons discussed with respect to Request for Admission No. 6 (admission that Complainant was issued a Social Security card).

The Court therefore GRANTS Respondent's motion as to Request for Production No. 2. Complainant is ORDERED to provide Respondent with a "true or correct copy of [his] social security card"; or, if that document is found at Exhibit 4-D, admit that the document is genuine. *Cf.* 28 C.F.R. § 68.21(a).

## 4. Request for Production of Documents No. 3

Request for Production No. 3 demands production of Complainant's "national identification card issued by the United States of America." Mot. Compel Disc. Ex. 1 ¶ 5.

To the Court's knowledge, the United States government does not produce a national identification card. Request for Production No. 3 therefore does not reference an identifiable document.

Arguably, this request could relate to Complainant's statement that he "provided a national identification card for employment purposes." Compl. 7. However, insofar as Respondent seeks the production of a document which Complainant believes or has previously described as a national identification card, Respondent does not make this point clear in its discovery request.

While several documents might, with some imagination, be construed as a national identification card, the Court should not guess at Respondent's meaning, nor fix the request to reflect what it believes a party is requesting, nor reframe the request to compel production of what a party might have asked. Consultadd, 15 OCAHO no. 1395a, at 9–10 ("A discovery request rises or falls on its own merit.").

Accordingly, the Court DENIES Respondent's motion as to Request for Production No. 3. Complainant is not required to take any action with respect to this request.

#### 5. Request for Production No. 4

Request for Production No. 4 directs Complainant to produce "all documents and communication(s) in any form," between Complainant and Respondent "concerning the claims and/or underlying facts alleged in the Complaint and/or any of [Complainant's] related letters to the Immigrant and Employee Rights Section (IER) and the Office of the Chief Administrative Hearing Officer (OCAHO)." Mot. Compel Disc. Ex. 1 ¶ 5. (emphasis added).

Before analyzing this request on its merits, the Court must first, sua sponte, address a drafting issue. See United States v. Chancery Staffing Sols., LLC, 13 OCAHO no. 1326a, 3 (2019) (citing 28 C.F.R. pt. 68) ("OCAHO has broad authority to control discovery."). Request for Production No. 4 is compound. This request seeks two discrete categories of information. See 28 C.F.R. § 68.20(c); see also Carbajal v. Warner, No. 10-CV-02862-REB-KLM, 2015 WL 4456190, at \*3–6 (D. Colo. July 21, 2015) (citing in part Kendall v. GES Exposition Servs., Inc., 174 F.R.D. 684 (D. Nev. 1997) (applying subpart/discrete question analysis for interrogatories to requests for production). As a consequence, it may be justly called two requests for production of documents, which would place Respondent over the Court's imposed limitation of ten.

The process of describing a discovery request as having discrete subparts is a difficult endeavor. Courts have inquired into what a "discrete subpart" means, and parties have argued over the same, for as long as the courts have imposed numerical limitations on the amounts of written discovery.

The phrase "and/or," which the Court emphasized above, does not in and of itself create a discrete subparts problem. Erfindergemeinschaft Uropep GbR v. Eli Lilly & Co., 315 F.R.D.



191, 195 (E.D. Tx. 2016) (“whether [the discovery] contains more than one “discrete separate subject” does not turn on whether the [discovery] has separately enumerated subparts. The subparts can be explicit or implicit.”) A party might, for instance, seek the production of a list of “all animals, and/or any lions, tigers, and bears.” While the framing of the request, using the disjunctive “or,” suggests that “animals” and the items which follow are distinct, the short list which follows are examples of animals, and therefore do not seek the production of an independent item.

This “primary question” test, which inquires into the primary intention or goal of the interrogatory, has been cited approvingly by many courts. *See, e.g., Ginn v. Gemini, Inc.*, 137 F.R.D. 320, 321 (D. Nev. 1991) (The court therefore holds that interrogatory subparts are to be counted as part of but one interrogatory [...] if they are logically or factually subsumed within and necessarily related to the primary question.”); *Trevino v. ACB Am., Inc.*, 232 F.R.D. 612, 614 (N.D. Cal. 2006) (same); *Swackhammer v. Sprint Corp. PCS*, 225 F.R.D. 658, 664-65 (D. Kan. 2004) (describing the inquiry as whether the discovery elicits details about a “common theme”).

In the context of requests for production of documents, a similar way of framing the question is to ask whether the greater includes the lesser — whether any of the listing of items sought reflect a category of information which might reasonably be said to include all the other items or categories of information sought. A demand for a list of “all lions, tigers, bears, and/or other animals” is really a request for all animals, however oddly phrased. By contrast, a request for a list of all “lions, tigers, bears, unicorns, and/or other animals” is a request for two categories of information — those related to real animals and imagined ones.

The Court acknowledges that a rule which counts requests for production of documents as unitary or single if they can be described as reflecting examples of a broader theme or category may lead to the drafting of more general or vague discovery requests. Making a demand for a broad category of information may lead to an objection of overbreadth or vagueness. While acknowledging the tension with other well-made objections, the Court does not, in this decision, address the interplay beyond noting that it may exist. In the particular matter sub judice, the Complainant has raised no objections of any sort, so this case presents no opportunity to address that dynamic.

The first discrete part of the request asks for items related to “the claims and/or underlying facts alleged in the Complaint” (hereinafter No. 4a). Mot. Compel Disc. Ex. 1 ¶ 5. The second discrete part of the request asks for an unrelated group of documents; that is, Complainant’s letters to IER and OCAHO (hereinafter No. 4b). *Id.*, *see also Superior Communications v. Earhugger, Inc.*, 257 F.R.D. 215, 218 (C.D. Calif. 2009) (Discovery calling for all “facts, persons, and documents” has three distinct subparts).

Allowing both Request for Production Nos. 4a and 4b would run afoul of the Court’s discovery limits. Therefore, the Court must decide whether to exclude later Requests for Production (after the ten allowed is reached), or alternatively, whether it may consider one request and exclude the other. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 68.18. The Court elects the latter option.

The Court will grant Request for Production No. 4a at the exclusion of Request for Production No. 4b. The Court weighed that Respondent structured its request to address No. 4a first, as well as the relevance of No. 4a to this case compared to No. 4b. More specifically, the communications or documents exchanged by the parties have higher probative value to the § 1324b discrimination alleged in the Complaint.<sup>8</sup>

The Court therefore GRANTS Respondent's motion as to Request for Production No. 4a. Complainant is ORDERED to provide the items identified in No. 4a to Respondent.

The Court DENIES Respondent's motion as to Request for Production No. 4b. Complainant is not required to take any action with respect to No. 4b.

#### 6. Request for Production No. 5

Request for Production No. 5 seeks "all documents and communication(s) in any form," between Complainant and Printing Arts "concerning the claims and/or underlying facts alleged in the Complaint and/or any of [Complainant's] related letters to [IER] and [OCAHO]." Mot. Compel. Disc. Ex. 1 ¶¶ 5–6 (emphasis added).

Request for Production No. 5 has a similar issue as the prior discovery request regarding discrete categories. The first part of the request asks for documents and communications between Complainant and Printing Arts (hereinafter No. 5a), *see* Mot. Compel Disc. Ex. 1 ¶ 5. The second part asks for Complainant's letters to IER and OCAHO (hereinafter No. 5b), *see id.* at Ex. 1 ¶¶ 5–6.

For similar reasons to Request for Production No. 4, the Court will consider Request for Production No. 5a to the exclusion of Request for Production No. 5b. Most significantly, items produced in response to No. 5a have higher probative value to the alleged § 1324b discrimination. Specifically, Complainant asserts in his Complaint that Printing Arts offered him a permanent position. Compl. 9.

Accordingly, the Court GRANTS Respondent's motion with regard to Request for Production No. 5a. Complainant is ORDERED to provide the items identified in No. 5a to Respondent.

The Court DENIES Respondent's motion as to Request for Production No. 5b. Complainant is not required to take any action with respect to No. 5b.

#### 7. Request for Production No. 6

Request for Production No. 6 seeks documents in any format "which relate in any matter to the facts alleged in the Complaint." Mot. Compel Disc. Ex. 1 ¶ 6.

---

<sup>8</sup> All parties have a copy of the Complaint, with the IER charge form and IER "right to sue" letter attached. Compl. 15–20, 24–25. Moreover, OCAHO's rules provide that Complainant must serve Respondent with a copy of any filing submitted to OCAHO. *See generally* 28 C.F.R. § 68.6.



This request is relevant for reasons similar to Request for Production No. 1 (documents used to answer Requests for Admission). The documents relate to facts connected to the alleged discrimination on account of citizenship status and national origin, retaliation based on § 1324b protected activity, and unfair documentary practices. *See generally* Compl.

The Court therefore GRANTS Respondent's motion as to Request for Production No. 6. Complainant is ORDERED to provide the items identified in this request to Respondent.

#### 8. Request for Production No. 7

Request for Production No. 7 demands "all documents relating to any complaints or reports of discrimination and/or retaliation that [Complainant] made to or about SSSI and/or Printing Arts." Mot. Compel Disc. Ex. 1 ¶ 6.

Again, these documents are relevant, as they relate to facts connected to Complainant's §§ 1324b(a)(1),(5) claims. Compl. 1–10.

The Court GRANTS Respondent's motion as to Request for Production No. 7. Complainant is ORDERED to provide the items identified in this request to Respondent.

#### 9. Request for Production No. 8

Request for Production No. 8 directs Complainant to produce "all documents relating to any income or other compensation received by [him]," from "May 15, 2022 to present." Mot. Compel Disc. Ex. 1 ¶ 6. The request includes a list of documents seemingly related to income. *See id.*

The listed documents are relevant to Complainant's calculation of damages. Compl. 11; *see* 8 U.S.C. §§ 1324b(g)(2)(B)–(C); *see also* Ogunrinu v. Law Res., 13 OCAHO no. 1332j, 19–21 (2021). The timeframe is narrowly tailored to begin from the date that Complainant seeks back pay. Compl. 11. Nevertheless, the Court declines to consider Social Security benefits and disability benefits as a matter of policy.<sup>9</sup>

Accordingly, the Court GRANTS IN PART and DENIES IN PART Respondent's motion as to Request for Production No. 8. Complainant is ORDERED to produce all documents identified in this request to Respondent, excluding those on: "social security benefits"; "social security disability benefits"; and "long-term or short-term disability benefits."

#### 10. Request for Production No. 9

Request for Production No. 9 asks for "all documents relating to [Complainant's] efforts to seek employment from May 15, 2022." Mot. Compel Disc. Ex. 1 ¶ 6.

---

<sup>9</sup> *See E.E.O.C. v. O'Grady*, 857 F.2d 383, 390 (7th Cir. 1988) ("[A]llowing a defendant to deduct social security payments from a back pay award would confer on the defendant a 'discrimination bonus.'")

This request is relevant to Complainant's calculation of damages for the same reasons set forth in discussing Request for Production No. 8 (documents on income/compensation).

The Court GRANTS Respondent's motion as to Request for Production No. 9. Complainant is ORDERED to provide the items identified in this request to Respondent.

#### 11. Request for Production No. 10

Request for Production No. 10 asks Complainant to produce "all documents [he] intend[s] to use as exhibits in the above captioned-matter." Mot. Compel Disc. Ex. 1 ¶ 7.

As with Request for Production No. 3, the Court is disinclined to "fix" a vague discovery request. Here, the phrase "exhibits in the above-captioned matter" could mean exhibits to use at hearing, exhibits in a written filing, or some other use. Therefore, this request does not reference an identifiable set of documents.

Accordingly, the Court DENIES Respondent's motion as to Request for Production No. 10. Complainant is not required to take any action with respect to this request.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

Respondent's Motion to Compel Discovery is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART. The Court summarizes its orders regarding each discovery request discussed.

Request for Admission No. 6 is deemed ADMITTED.

The Court ORDERS Complainant to respond to these discovery requests as originally drafted: Requests for Production Nos. 1, 2, 6, 7, and 9. Additionally, the Court ORDERS Complainant to respond to these discovery requests as amended by this Order: Request for Production Nos. 4a, 5a, and 8.

For the above-identified requests, Complainant is ORDERED to respond by November 17, 2023. Complainant's failure to comply may result in a sanction pursuant to 28 C.F.R. § 68.23.

The motion is DENIED as to Requests for Production Nos. 3 and 10. The motion is also DENIED for the following discovery requests, pursuant to amendments made by this Order: Requests for Production Nos. 4b and 5b.

#### V. AMENDED SCHEDULING ORDER

In light of the ongoing discovery and pending motions before this Court, the Court GRANTS Respondent's Motion to Amend Scheduling Order. The Court hereby amends the scheduling order to the following:

- November 17, 2023: Complainant must serve compelled discovery on Respondent
- December 22, 2023: Deadlines for supplementation to dispositive motions
- January 26, 2024: Deadline for supplementation of any opposition to dispositive motions
- February 12, 2024: Deadline for replies in support of dispositive motions
- May 2, 2024: Final prehearing statements due
- May 9, 2024 at 2 pm Eastern: Final prehearing conference (telephonic)
- May 23-24, 2024: Hearing, to be held in Chicago, Illinois

SO ORDERED.

Dated and entered on October 31, 2023.

---

Honorable John A. Henderson  
Administrative Law Judge