

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

July 1, 2025

LASZLO VASKO,)	
Complainant,)	
)	
)	8 U.S.C. § 1324b Proceeding
v.)	OCAHO Case No. 2025B00023
)	
)	
UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,)	
Respondent.)	
)	

FINAL ORDER OF DISMISSAL – ABANDONED COMPLAINT

This case arises under the antidiscrimination provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, 8 U.S.C. § 1324b.

On December 2, 2024, Complainant, Laszlo Vasko, filed a Complaint with the Office of the Chief Administrative Hearing Officer (OCAHO) against Respondent, Uber Technologies, Inc.

On January 17, 2025, the Chief Administrative Hearing Officer sent a Notice of Case Assignment for Complaint Alleging Unfair Immigration-Related Employment Practices (NOCA) and a copy of the Complaint, via USPS certified mail, to the address provided by Complainant.

The USPS website indicates the NOCA package was retrieved from a postal facility; however, the Court could not determine whether Respondent was properly served (causing the Court to issue an Order Directing Complainant to Provide Respondent Address (Service of Complaint). *Laszlo Vasko v. Uber Techs., Inc.*, 21 OCAHO no. 1634a (2025).¹

¹ Citations to OCAHO precedents in bound volumes one through eight include the volume and case number of the particular decision followed by the specific page in the bound volume where the decision begins; the pinpoint citations which follow are to the pages, seriatim, of the specific entire volume. Pinpoint citations to OCAHO precedents after volume eight, 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 through the Westlaw database “FIM OCAHO,” the LexisNexis database “OCAHO,” and on the United States Department of Justice’s website: <https://www.justice.gov/eoir/office-of-the-chief-administrative-hearing-officer-decisions>.

Where the Court is unable to perfect service of a complaint, the Rules allow for it to “direct that a party execute service of process.” 28 C.F.R. § 68.3(c). The Court ordered Complainant to effectuate service of the Complaint by doing one of the following: (1) submitting “a supplement to the Complaint, identifying an officer, director, or registered agent, or stating that the address for the Respondent is incorrect and providing a working mailing address for Respondent”, *id.* at 3.; (2) requesting “that the Court permit Complainant to serve Respondent” in accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(h), *id.*; or (3) requesting the Court permit “an alternative form of service” not contemplated by either Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(h) or Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 415.50. *Id.* Complainant was given 60 days to do so (or by June 8, 2025), and was placed on notice that failure to do so could result in dismissal without prejudice. *Id.*

To date, the Court has not received a filing or communication from Complainant.

OCAHO’s Rules provide that “[a] complaint or request for hearing may be dismissed upon its abandonment by the party or parties who filed it.” 28 C.F.R. § 68.37(b). One of the potential grounds for dismissal by abandonment is where “[a] party or his or her representative fails to respond to orders issued by the Administrative Law Judge.” 28 C.F.R. § 68.37(b)(1); *see also Contreras v. Cavco Indus., Inc.*, 16 OCAHO no. 1440f, 3 (2024).

Here, Complainant has failed to respond to the Court’s order and has left the case in a posture where the Complaint cannot be effectively served on Respondent. Complainant was placed on notice of the prospect of dismissal absent action on his part, and at the juncture, the Court now does in fact DISMISS the Complaint WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

This is a Final Order.²

SO ORDERED.

Dated and entered on July 1, 2025.

Honorable Andrea R. Carroll-Tipton
Administrative Law Judge

² 8 U.S.C. § 1324b(g)(1); 28 C.F.R. § 68.52(e).

Appeal Information

This order shall become the final agency order unless modified, vacated, or remanded by the Attorney General. Provisions governing the Attorney General's review of this order are set forth at 28 C.F.R. pt. 68. Within sixty days of the entry of an Administrative Law Judge's final order, the Attorney General may direct the CAHO to refer any final order to the Attorney General for review, pursuant to 28 C.F.R. § 68.55.

Any person aggrieved by the final order has sixty days from the date of entry of the final order to petition for review in the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the violation is alleged to have occurred or in which the employer resides or transacts business. See 8 U.S.C. § 1324b(i)(1); 28 C.F.R. § 68.57. A petition for review must conform to the requirements of Rule 15 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.