

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

May 13, 2025

ZAJI OBATALA ZAJRADHARA,)	
Complainant,)	
)	
v.)	8 U.S.C. § 1324b Proceeding
)	OCAHO Case No. 2024B00063
)	
PURE WATER CORP.,)	
Respondent.)	
_____)	

Appearances: Zaji O. Zajradhara, pro se Complainant
Mark A. Scoggins, Esq., for Respondent

ORDER REJECTING TRANSCRIPT

On April 30, 2025, Complainant filed a motion entitled Complainant’s Motion to Compel Subpoenas and Supra Motion to Compel Subpoenas, Request Reconsideration, Take Judicial Notice, and Address Constitutional and Statutory Violations.¹ As an attachment, Complainant attempted to submit an audio MP3 file. Court staff informed Complainant that the Court is unable to accept audio files and requested that he file a transcript of the audio recording if he wished to submit the attachment.²

In response, Complainant submitted a Motion for Addendum to Include Transcript of Phone Call as Evidence of CNMI Department of Labor’s Violations on May 1, 2025, accompanied by a file in .TXT format. Complainant’s .TXT file appears to contain transcribed dialogue, but the transcript does not indicate who is speaking and when the speaker changes, nor does it include any verification that the transcript’s content accurately reflects the audio recording, such as an affidavit attesting to its accuracy or a notary’s seal and certification of the transcription’s contents. *See*

¹ The lengthy procedural history in this case is detailed in “Order on Discovery,” issued April 28, 2025.

² This Court has been clear that it “cannot accept filings in [audio] format, and parties must instead provide all filings and case related documents in Portable Document Format (PDF),” where a case is e-filing, “unless otherwise instructed by the presiding [Administrative Law Judge].” *Ehere v. HawaiiUSA Fed. Credit Union*, 17 OCAHO no. 1471a, 3 (2023).

Klimas v. Dep't of Treasury, 3 OCAHO no. 419, 216, 223-224 (1992) (noting that despite Court orders to submit certified transcripts, the complainant had only submitted uncertified transcripts with a notary's seal but no certification of the accuracy of the contents). As such, it is not an acceptable transcript and the Court REJECTS it.

Complainant's Motion for Addendum to Include Transcript of Phone Call is DENIED.

Complainant is free to refile the transcript. However, any re-filed transcript must be in PDF format, must label who is speaking when, and must include a certification of accuracy of the transcript's contents - either an accompanying affidavit or a notary's seal and certification of the contents' accuracy.

SO ORDERED.

Dated and entered on May 13, 2025.

Honorable Jean C. King
Chief Administrative Law Judge