

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. 2024B00110   |
|                | ) |                             |
|                | ) |                             |
| DROPBOX, INC., | ) |                             |
| Respondent.    | ) |                             |
|                | ) |                             |

---

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

ORDER GRANTING JOINT 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. Complainant Qun Wang filed a Complaint with the Office of the Chief Administrative Hearing Officer (OCAHO) against Respondent Dropbox, Inc. on June 4, 2024, alleging that Respondent discriminated against him on the basis of his citizenship status. Compl. 6.

On May 30, 2025, the parties filed a Joint Motion for Extension of Deadlines, stating that they “have been attempting to resolve discovery issues and schedule Complainant’s deposition” and to accommodate further discovery exchanges and the scheduling of the deposition, they request an extension of deadlines. Joint Mot. Extension 1-2. The parties propose an updated case schedule. Id. at 2.

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.” Tingling v. City of Richmond, 13 OCAHO no. 1324c, 2 (2021) (citations omitted); see also United States v. Space Exploration Techs., 18 OCAHO no. 1499, 5 (2023) (citing United States v. Exim,

---

<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 <https://www.justice.gov/eoir/office-of-the-chief-administrative-hearing-officer-regulations>.

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.’” United States v. Zarco Hotels, Inc., 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 the parties have demonstrated good cause for an extension of the case deadlines. To better facilitate the completion of discovery, the case deadlines are amended as follows:

|   |   |
|---|---|
| • Discovery closes:                                       | July 30, 2025                                     |
| • Dispositive motions deadline: <sup>3</sup>              | September 2, 2025                                 |
| • Deadline for response to dispositive motions:           | October 3, 2025                                   |
| • Deadline for replies in support of dispositive motions: | October 20, 2025                                  |
| • Final prehearing statements due:                        | December 16, 2025                                 |
| • Prehearing Conference:                                  | January 21, 2026 at 4:00 pm<br>ET (Telephonic)    |
| • Hearing:  | February 19-20, 2026<br>(In person, location TBD) |

SO ORDERED.

Dated and entered on June 16, 2025.

---

Honorable John A. Henderson  
Administrative Law Judge

---

<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 <https://www.justice.gov/eoir/office-of-the-chief-administrative-hearing-officer-decisions>.

<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.