

PUBLIC

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES**

---

In the Matter of

Eusabio Juarez-Ruffino,

Appellant.

---

)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

Docket No. 9444

**HEARING ORDER NO. 2**

My December 2, 2025 Order On Petition for Review and Motion to Stay, among other things, directed that an evidentiary hearing will be held in this proceeding. I thereafter issued Hearing Order No. 1, dated December 12, 2025, which directed, among other things, that:

3. By no later than January 7, 2026 (the “Disclosure Date”), Mr. Juarez’s counsel must either:

a. **ADVISE** the Authority [i.e., the Horseracing Safety and Integrity Authority] that the purported affidavit by Mr. Terrazas, included as Appeal Book (“AB1”) 583-86, will constitute Mr. Terrazas’s witness statement for the evidentiary hearing; or

b. **SERVE** on the Authority a witness statement, signed by Mr. Terrazas, together with any documents that Mr. Juarez seeks to offer as evidence through Mr. Terrazas at the evidentiary hearing.

Mr. Juarez’s compliance with this requirement in turn triggers action by the Authority in connection with the evidentiary hearing orders. Hearing Order No. 1

¶¶ 4, 5.

PUBLIC

On January 12, 2026, the Authority filed a Request for Clarification of Hearing Order #1, in which it advised that, as of that date, “Mr. Juarez’s counsel has neither advised the Authority that the affidavit included as Appeal Book (“AB1”) 583-86 will be Mr. Terrazas’ witness statement for the hearing nor provided the Authority with a new signed witness statement for Mr. Terrazas.” *Id.* at 3. The Authority sought clarification regarding the appropriate course of action in these circumstances. Later that same day, the Office of Administrative Law Judges received a copy of an email from counsel for Mr. Juarez to counsel for the Authority, stating: “Mr. Juarez relies on the signed Affidavit as his Witness Statement. Mr. Juarez does not propose any other items for consideration as Exhibits.”

Mr. Juarez thus cured his failure to comply with paragraph 3 of Hearing Order No. 1. However, his non-compliance needlessly burdened the Authority and this Court. I will therefore repeat the “cautionary observation” with which I closed my December 2, 2025 Order:

Procedural Order No. 1 in the arbitration instructed that “[a]ll deadlines and requirements stated herein will be strictly enforced.” Mr. Juarez’s counsel’s attention to, and compliance with, the Arbitrator’s instruction left much to be desired, to put it charitably. I will not tolerate any similar disregard. The deadlines in this case will be strictly enforced as to all parties.

*Id.* at 32 (footnote omitted).

It is hereby **ORDERED** that:

1. The January 20, 2026 date for the Authority’s actions called for in paragraph 4 of Hearing Order No. 1 is extended to and including January 26, 2026,

**PUBLIC**

2. The “Disclosure Date” referred to in paragraph 3 of Hearing Order No. 1 shall be January 12, 2026.

**ORDERED:**

*Jay L. Himes*  
Jay L. Himes  
Administrative Law Judge

Date: January 13, 2026