

US TECH WORKERS ET AL.,¹)
Complainant,)
) 8 U.S.C. § 1324b Proceeding
v.) OCAHO Case No. 2025B00009
))
GENSLER,)
Respondent.)
_____)

ORDER GRANTING IN PART MOTION TO RECAPTION COMPLAINT

Complainant seeks to modify the Complaint in two ways. First, and most straightforward, is a change to the case caption. This portion of the motion is GRANTED. Parties shall use the newly proposed case caption on all filings moving forward (as it appears in this Order).

¹ “Et al.” refers to the following named individuals: John Broberg, John Robert, John Donaldson, John Dale, Steve Ellwood, Riley Byrd, Jeff Odgis, and Nathan Overbey.

The second modification seeks to “strike” portions of the Complaint. Respondent does not oppose this request. All considered, this is a grantable request; however, proceeding as proposed by Complainant invites confusion into the record. Consequently, Complainant is instead granted leave to amend his complaint² (i.e. Complainant is to remove the portions of the Complaint he outlined and serve this amended complaint on the Court and Respondent. Respondent shall have an opportunity to be heard on this revised filing. Specifically, Respondent may provide its position, in writing, within 30 days of receipt of the amended complaint.).

Complainant’s Motion to Recaption is GRANTED in part. Complainant is ORDERED to file his amended complaint within 20 days of the date of this Order.

SO ORDERED.

Dated and entered on April 21, 2025.

Honorable Andrea R. Carroll-Tipton
Administrative Law Judge

² Under 28 C.F.R. § 68.9(e), a complainant may amend a complaint “[if] a determination of a controversy on the merits will be facilitated thereby” and “upon such conditions are necessary to avoid prejudicing the public interests and rights of the parties[.]”