10

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

QUN WANG, Complainant,	)	
-	)	8 U.S.C. § 1324b Proceeding
V.	)	OCAHO Case No. 2024B001
DROPBOX, INC., Respondent.	) )	
P	)	

Appearances: Qun Wang, pro se Complainant Sean M. McCrory, Esq., for Respondent

## ORDER GRANTING RESPONDENT'S UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF DEADLINES

This case arises under the unfair immigration-related employment practices provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended by the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, 8 U.S.C. § 1324b.

On March 25, 2025, Respondent filed an Unopposed Motion for an Extension of Deadlines, requesting a "brief extension of some deadlines, but not the final hearing date or prehearing statements, to allow the Parties to complete the discovery process with no prejudice to either party," due to medical reasons. Mot. Extension 1. Respondent requests discovery be extended to May 16, 2024, with dispositive motions due on June 16, 2025. Respondent also certifies that Complainant was consulted and did not oppose the motion. <u>Id</u>. at 3.

OCAHO's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 28 C.F.R. pt. 68 (2024),<sup>1</sup> "do not provide specific standards for granting extension, but the standard routinely applied is good cause." <u>Tingling v. City of Richmond</u>, 13 OCAHO no. 1324c, 2 (2021) (citations omitted); see also <u>United States v. Space Exploration Techs.</u>, 18 OCAHO no. 1499, 5 (2023) (citing <u>United States</u>)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> OCAHO Rules of Practice and Procedure, 28 C.F.R. pt. 68 (2024). The rules are also available through OCAHO's webpage on the United States Department of Justice's website. *See* <u>https://www.justice.gov/eoir/office-of-the-chief-administrative-hearing-officer-regulations</u>.

<u>v. Exim</u>, 3 OCAHO no. 591, 1925, 1929 (1993)).<sup>2</sup> "Good cause requires 'a demonstration of good faith on the party of the party seeking an enlargement of time and some reasonable basis for noncompliance within the time specified in the rules." <u>United States v. Zarco Hotels, Inc.</u>, 18 OCAHO no. 1518c, 1-2 (2024) (citing Lowden v. Ann Arbor Elec., JATC Training Ctr., 18 OCAHO No. 1490, 2 (2023)).

The Court finds that Respondent has demonstrated good cause for an extension of the case deadlines. Moreover, Respondent indicated that Complainant was consulted and does not oppose the motion. Accordingly, the Court GRANTS the motion. The case deadlines are amended as follows:

• Discovery closes:	May 16, 2025
• Dispositive motions deadline: <sup>3</sup>	June 16, 2025
• Deadline for opposition to dispositive motions:	July 17, 2025
• Deadline to file replies in support of dispositive motions:	August 4, 2025
• Final prehearing statements due:	September 30, 2025
• Final prehearing conference (telephonic):	October 8, 2025 at 2 pm ET
• Hearing date:	October 21-22, 2025

## SO ORDERED.

Dated and entered on March 28, 2025.

Honorable John A. Henderson Administrative Law Judge

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Citations to OCAHO precedents reprinted in bound Volumes 1 through 8 reflect the volume number and the case number of the particular decision, followed by the specific page in that volume where the decision begins; the pinpoint citations which follow are thus to the pages, seriatim, of the specific entire volume. Pinpoint citations to OCAHO precedents subsequent to Volume 8, where the decision has not yet been reprinted in a bound volume, are to pages within the original issuances; the beginning page number of an unbound case will always be 1, and is accordingly omitted from the citation. Published decisions may be accessed in the Westlaw database "FIMOCAHO," or in the LexisNexis database "OCAHO," or on the website at <a href="https://www.justice.gov/eoir/office-of-the-chief-administrative-hearing-officer-decisions">https://www.justice.gov/eoir/office-of-the-chief-administrative-hearing-officer-decisions.</a>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> If either party files a dispositive motion prior to the deadline, pursuant to Section XI of the General Litigation Order, the opposing party will have 30 days from receipt of the dispositive motion to file an opposition, and the moving party's deadline for a reply in support of the motion will be 14 days from receipt of the opposition.