

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

NATASHA WILLIAMS,	)	
Complainant,	)	
	)	
	)	8 U.S.C. § 1324b Proceeding
v.	)	OCAHO Case No. 2025B00002
	)	
	)	
CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.,	)	
Respondent.	)	
	)	

---

Appearances: Natasha Williams, pro se Complainant  
K. Edward Raleigh, Esq., and Anna Perina, Esq., for Respondent

ORDER SETTING DEADLINE FOR COMPLAINANT'S  
RESPONSE TO RESPONDENT'S MOTION TO DISMISS

I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

This case arises under the antidiscrimination provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), as amended, 8 U.S.C. § 1324b. On October 1, 2024, Complainant Natasha Williams filed a Complaint with the Office of the Chief Administrative Hearing Officer (OCAHO), against Respondent Cisco Systems, Inc. Complainant alleged that Respondent retaliated against her in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1324b(a)(5). On November 29, 2024, Respondent filed an Answer denying Complainant's allegations, setting forth affirmative defenses, and providing exhibits.

On November 18, 2024, Respondent filed Respondent's Motion to Dismiss, raising arguments regarding the timeliness of the Complaint, the scope of the claims in the Complaint compared to the claims raised in Complainant's charge form submitted to the Department of Justice's Immigrant and Employee Rights Section, Civil Right Division, and whether Complainant has stated a claim upon which relief may be granted. To date, Complainant has not filed a response.

## II. RESPONSE TO MOTION TO DISMISS DEADLINE

Under OCAHO's Rules of Practice and Procedure, unless the Administrative Law Judge has fixed an alternate response deadline, parties may file responses to motions "[w]ithin ten (10) days after a written motion is served," 28 C.F.R. § 68.11(b), with an additional five days added where the motion is served by ordinary mail. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 68.8(c)(2). Accordingly, Complainant's response deadline was November 29, 2024.

However, the Court takes note of the fact that Complainant is pro se. Additionally, Complainant has contacted the Court by both phone and email, expressing that she believes she did file a timely Complaint which was ultimately not received by this Court due to mail issues. Complainant also states that she has supporting documentation demonstrating her earlier attempt to file the Complaint timely. If the Complainant would like the Court to consider her arguments regarding the timeliness of her Complaint and her supporting documentation, as well as any arguments addressing the other aspects of Respondent's Motion to Dismiss, she must submit a response to the Motion to Dismiss. The parties must also be sure to send a copy of all communications to the Court with the other party in the litigation, including a certificate of service attesting to the manner and date of service. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 68.6(a).

Complainant's response to the Motion to Dismiss, along with any supporting documentation or exhibits she may wish to submit, is now **due within 21 days of the date of this Order**. Filing a response is voluntary, but the Court notes that if Complainant does not file a response, it will only consider the Complaint and the Motion to Dismiss when ruling on the Motion to Dismiss. Any response to the Motion to Dismiss should address each of Respondent's arguments for dismissal.

Respondent's reply in support of its Motion to Dismiss will be **due within 15 days of service of any response that Complainant may file**.

## III. RESPONDENT'S MOTION TO STAY ANSWER DEADLINE DENIED AS MOOT

Because Respondent filed its Answer on November 29, 2024, the Court now also DENIES AS MOOT Respondent's earlier Motion to Stay Answer Deadline Pending Motion to Dismiss.

SO ORDERED

Dated and entered December 17, 2024.

---

Honorable John A. Henderson  
Administrative Law Judge