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

August 25, 2025

MIKHAIL NAZARENKO, Complainant,	)	
V.	) ) )	8 U.S.C. § 1324b Proceeding OCAHO Case No. 2025B00048
META PLATFORMS, INC., TASKUS, INC., TASKUS GREECE, Respondent.	) ) )	
	)	

Appearances: Mikhail Nazarenko, pro se Complainant Stephanie Generotti, Esq., for Respondents

## **ORDER**

This case arises under the antidiscrimination provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), as amended, 8 U.S.C. § 1324b. Complainant, Mikhail Nazarenko, filed a complaint with the Office of the Chief Administrative Hearing Officer (OCAHO) on June 2, 2025. Complainant alleges that Respondents discriminated against him on the basis of citizenship status and national origin, retaliated against him, and engaged in unlawful documentary practices in violation of 8 U.S.C. §§ 1324b(a)(1), (a)(5), and (a)(6).

On July 16, 2025, Respondents filed a Motion to Stay Deadline to Respond to Complainant's Complaint, and a Motion to Dismiss the complaint. This Court issued an order to stay Respondents' Answer deadline pending a decision on the motion to dismiss on July 17, 2025.

On August 5, 2025, Complainant filed "Response to Motion to Dismiss, Motion to Stay Deadline, Notice of Appearance signed by Stephanie C. Generotti, Order Granting Respondent's Motion to Stay Answer Deadline, Motions, Request of the Complainant and Other." [Complainant] has submitted six additional filings since then, specifically on August 12, 14, 19, 20, 21, and 22 seeking to add various arguments and exhibits to his response.

An Administrative Law Judge has the authority to conduct fair and impartial hearings. 28 C.F.R. § 68.28. Inherent in this authority is a duty to conduct proceedings in an efficient and orderly

manner. Pro se litigants are afforded great lenience, but the scope afforded a pro se litigant can lead to a breakdown in orderly process. *See, e.g. Santiglia v. Sun Microsystems, Inc.*, 9 OCAHO no. 1104, 21 (2004). This case has reached that point with the deluge of additions to Complainant's August 5, 2025, filing. This kind of piecemeal litigation makes responding to the various arguments and documents on the part of Respondent difficult, causes confusion and places strain on the court's resources.

The parties are now ORDERED to abide by the following requirements related to motion practice. Failure to comply with these requirements may result in rejection of the filing.

- 1. Any "additions" or supplements to a motion must contain a motion seeking leave to file a supplement to the motion. As a general matter, only one such addition or supplement will be granted.
- 2. The Court will reject any further additions or supplements to Complainant's August 5, 2025, filing. Complainant may file any motions he believes necessary to his case so long as they are not intended to be part of the August 5, 2025, filing.

Should Respondent seek to file a Reply to Complainant's August 5, 2025, response and supplemental filings, it may do so by September 8, 2025. Any sur-reply on the part of Complainant to that filing, if made, must be accompanied by a motion seeking permission to so reply. 8 C.F.R. § 68.11(b).

SO ORDERED.

Dated and entered on August 25, 2025.

Honorable Jean C. King Chief Administrative Law Judge