



UNITED STATES
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
BEFORE THE ADMINISTRATOR

In the Matter of:)
)
Henry Simpson,) Docket No. CWA-09-2026-0016
d/b/a Buena Vista Subdivision)
Santa Rita, Guam,)
)
Respondent.)

ORDER GRANTING RESPONDENT’S UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR EXTENSION

I am in receipt of Respondent’s February 19, 2026, Unopposed Motion for Extension of Time to File Answer to Amended Administrative Complaint (“Motion”), which requests a single-day extension of Respondent’s deadline to file the referenced document. The Motion explains that Respondent attempted to timely file its Answer to Amended Administrative Complaint; Request for Hearing (“Amended Answer”) on the February 18, 2026, deadline, but was unable to do so due to a delay in registering for the Administrative Law Judges Division E-Filing System. Mot. 2; Mot. Ex A ¶¶ 5–6. Respondent’s counsel aver that they have consulted with counsel for the Complainant about the Motion, and that Complainant does not oppose the relief requested. Mot. 2; Mot. Ex A ¶ 8.

This matter is governed by the Consolidated Rules of Practice Governing the Administrative Assessment of Civil Penalties and the Revocation/Termination or Suspension of Permits (“Rules of Practice”) set forth at 40 C.F.R. Part 22. Pursuant to the Rules of Practice, I “may grant an extension of time for filing any document: upon timely motion of a party to the proceeding, for good cause shown, and after consideration of prejudice to other parties; or upon [my] own initiative.” 40 C.F.R. § 22.7(b).

Here, the Motion was filed as soon as practicable and shows good cause, taking into account the absence of prejudice to Complainant. Respondent credibly represents that its minimal delay in filing the Amended Answer was the result of an administrative issue that was corrected as quickly as possible. The Motion is also unopposed, reflecting the absence of prejudice from the filing delay. In these circumstances, I find good cause to permit the belated filing. The Motion is therefore hereby **GRANTED**, and Respondent’s Amended Answer is deemed accepted as of the date filed.

SO ORDERED.



Michael B. Wright
Chief Administrative Law Judge

Dated: February 20, 2026
Washington, D.C.

In the Matter of *Henry Simpson, d/b/a Buena Vista Subdivision, Santa Rita, Guam*, Respondent.
Docket No. CWA-09-2026-0016

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that the foregoing **Order Granting Respondent's Unopposed Motion for Extension**, dated February 20, 2026, and issued by Chief Administrative Law Judge Michael B. Wright, was sent this day to the following parties in the manner indicated below.



Stefanie Neale
Attorney Advisor

Original by ALJD E-Filing System to:
Mary Angeles, Headquarters Hearing Clerk
Administrative Law Judges Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
<https://yosemite.epa.gov/OA/EAB/EAB-ALJ Upload.nsf>

Copy by Electronic Mail to:
Erin Brewer
Assistant Regional Counsel
Office of Regional Counsel
U.S. EPA – Region IX
75 Hawthorne Street, (ORC 2-4)
San Francisco, CA 94105
Email: Brewer.Erin@epa.gov
For Complainant

Delia Lujan Wolff
Lujan & Wolff LLP
238 Archbishop Flores Street, Suite 300
DNA Building
Hagatna, Guam 96910
Email: dslwolff@lawguam.com
For Respondent

Dated: February 20, 2026
Washington, D.C.