

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

IRFAN JAVAID,	)	
Complainant,	)	
	)	
v.	)	8 U.S.C. § 1324b Proceeding
	)	OCAHO Case No. 2023B00067
	)	
FURTHER, LLC, D/B/A	)	
FURTHER ENTERPRISE SOLUTIONS,	)	
Respondent.	)	
	)	

---

Appearances: Irfan Javaid, pro se Complainant  
David Lacki, Esq., for Respondent

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

I. BACKGROUND

This case arises under the antidiscrimination provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), as amended, 8 U.S.C. § 1324b. On June 7, 2023, Complainant Irfan Javaid filed a complaint with the Office of the Chief Administrative Hearing Officer (OCAHO) asserting claims of discrimination and retaliation arising under 8 U.S.C. § 1324b against Respondent Further LLC. Respondent filed an answer on August 1, 2023.

On May 31, 2023, the parties filed their Joint Motion for an Order of Voluntary Dismissal of Respondent. In it, Complainant “moves for the voluntary dismissal, with prejudice of the claims against Respondent . . . pursuant to 28 C.F.R. § 68.14.” Joint Mot. Voluntary Dismissal 1. The parties attach a copy of their settlement agreement and state that they “have reached [a] full settlement and [have] agreed upon dismissal of the above action.” Id.

II. LAW AND ANALYSIS

Under 28 C.F.R. § 68.14(a)(1)-(2), when “the parties . . . have entered into a settlement agreement” they have the option to “[s]ubmit to the presiding Administrative Law Judge: [t]he agreement containing consent findings; and [a] proposed decision and order,” or “[n]otify the

Administrative Law Judge that the parties have reached a full settlement and have agreed to dismissal of the action.”

Here, although the parties state that they seek a “voluntary dismissal,” they request dismissal pursuant to 28 C.F.R § 68.14, stating that they have reached a full settlement and attaching their signed settlement agreement to the motion. The Court therefore considers the motion to be a joint motion of dismissal pursuant to settlement. The court finds that the parties have complied with the requirements of 28 C.F.R. § 68.14(a)(2). Having reviewed the submission, including the settlement agreement, the Court finds that the agreement is fair and therefore the motion is GRANTED and this matter is DISMISSED with prejudice.

The Court accordingly DENIES AS MOOT Respondent’s pending Motion to Extend the Deadlines for Filing Dispositive Motions and Motion to Compel Response to Discovery.

SO ORDERED.

Dated and entered on June 24, 2024.

---

John A. Henderson  
Administrative Law Judge

### Appeal Information

This order shall become the final agency order unless modified, vacated, or remanded by the Attorney General. Provisions governing the Attorney General's review of this order are set forth at 28 C.F.R. pt. 68. Within sixty days of the entry of an Administrative Law Judge's final order, the Attorney General may direct the CAHO to refer any final order to the Attorney General for review, pursuant to 28 C.F.R. § 68.55.

Any person aggrieved by the final order has sixty days from the date of entry of the final order to petition for review 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. See 8 U.S.C. § 1324b(i)(1); 28 C.F.R. § 68.57. A petition for review must conform to the requirements of Rule 15 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.