

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

July 14, 2025

US TECH WORKERS ET AL.,)	
Complainant,)	
)	
v.)	8 U.S.C. § 1324b Proceeding
)	OCAHO Case No. 2024B00102
UL SOLUTIONS, INC.,)	
Respondent.)	
<hr style="border: 0.5px solid black;"/>)	

Appearances: John M. Miano, Esq., for Complainant
Sean M. McCrory, Esq., and Monica S. Rodriguez, Esq., for Respondent

ORDER REFERRING CASE TO THE SETTLEMENT OFFICER PROGRAM

This case arises under the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), as amended, 8 U.S.C. § 1324b. Complainant, US Tech Workers et al., filed a complaint with the Office of the Chief Administrative Hearing Officer (OCAHO) on April 23, 2024. Complainant alleges that Respondent, UL LLC d/b/a UL Solutions, Inc., discriminated on the basis of citizenship status in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1324b. Respondent filed its Answer and Affirmative Defenses on June 6, 2024.

On July 23, 2024, the Court held a telephonic prehearing conference where this Administrative Law Judge set the case schedule. Subsequently Complainant filed a Motion to Consolidate, Stay Discovery, and for Leave to File a Consolidated Amended Complaint which this Court denied on November 06, 2024. *US Tech Workers et al. v. UL Solutions, Inc.*, 20 OCAHO no. 1601a (2024).

On November 8, 2024, Complainant filed a Motion for Leave to File an Amended Complaint, and attached the First Amended Complaint with Exhibits. Respondent did not file an opposition. On February 27, 2025, this Court granted the Motion to Amend the Complaint and set a new case schedule, which was extended on April 2, 2025. *US Tech Workers et al. v. UL Solutions, Inc.*, 20 OCAHO no. 1601b (2025); *US Tech Workers et al. v. UL Solutions, Inc.*, 20 OCAHO no. 1601c (2025). Under the revised case schedule, discovery closed on June 18, 2025, and dispositive motions are due July 17, 2025. *UL Solutions, Inc.*, 20 OCAHO no. 1601c, at 2.

On July 10, 2025, the parties filed a Joint Motion for Referral to the OCAHO Settlement Program, stating that they have concluded discovery and engaged in initial settlement discussions. Joint

Mot. Referral 1. The parties indicate that they believe the OCAHO settlement program would be beneficial to resolving the matter and request a stay of all upcoming deadlines and hearings. *Id.* The motion was signed by counsel for both parties.

Pursuant to the August 3, 2020, EOIR Policy Memorandum 20-16, a presiding administrative law judge may make a referral to the Settlement Officer Program upon written consent of both parties. The Court discussed OCAHO's Settlement Officer Program with the parties at the July 23, 2024, settlement conference, but the parties indicated that they were not interested at that time. Order Summarizing P'hr'g Conf. 2. Given that the Court has previously discussed the program with the parties, the fact that both parties are represented, and the parties submitted a joint, written request, the Court finds that referral is appropriate. The Court ORDERS that this matter be referred to the Settlement Officer Program for a period of sixty days, beginning on July 21, 2025, and ending on September 19, 2025. The Court designates the Honorable Carol Bell, Administrative Law Judge, as the Settlement Officer for this case.

The referral may be extended for an additional 30 days upon the parties' request to the Settlement Officer. At the end of the referral period, the case will return to active litigation.

Should the parties reach a settlement by the end of the referral period, they shall inform the undersigned of such settlement and provide an appropriate filing to depart the forum. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 68.14. If the parties do not reach a settlement, they should anticipate an order for status reports or a prehearing conference to reset case deadlines.

All proceedings are STAYED during the referral period. Copies of the Settlement Officer Program's rules are provided to the parties with this Order.

SO ORDERED.

Dated and entered on July 14, 2025.

Honorable Jean C. King
Chief Administrative Law Judge