

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

December 17, 2025

MICHAEL BROWNE,)	
Complainant,)	
)	
)	
v.)	8 U.S.C. § 1324b Proceeding
)	OCAHO Case No. 2025B00060
)	
PINTEREST, INC.,)	
Respondent.)	
)	

Appearances: Daniel Low, Esq., and Lindsey Grunert, Esq., for Complainant
Esther Lander, Esq., for Respondent

ORDER GRANTING RESPONDENT MOTION FOR EXTENSION

This matter arises under the antidiscrimination provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended by the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA), 8 U.S.C. § 1324b.

On August 14, 2025, Complainant filed a complaint with the Office of the Chief Administrative Hearing Officer (OCAHO) against Respondent.

On September 11, 2025, the Chief Administrative Hearing Officer sent the parties a Notice of Case Assignment for Complaint Alleging Unfair Immigration-Related Employment Practices (NOCA) and a copy of the Complaint. An answer is due within thirty (30) days after service of the complaint. *See* 28 C.F.R. §§ 68.3(b), 68.9(a).¹ The NOCA and Complaint were delivered on September 16, 2025, making an answer due by October 16, 2025.

On October 1, 2025, a lapse in appropriations occurred, which caused the Court to functionally “shutdown” until November 12, 2025 (when funding was restored). During the “shutdown” period, no filings were processed.

¹ OCAHO Rules of Practice and Procedure, 28 C.F.R. pt. 68 (2022).

On November 14, 2025 Respondent “filed”² two unopposed motions – one seeking an extension of the answer deadline, and one seeking a stay for 30 days.

As to the extension of time, Respondent notes the filing is unopposed (and provides sufficient evidence of Complainant’s position), it is the first extension request, and additional time would allow Respondent an opportunity to “investigate the allegations and explore early resolution.” Motion for Extension 2. As to a request for a stay filed via a separate motion, Respondent relies on the same good cause rationale.

While the motions are approaching a point of mootness based on the timing of the processing of the filings,³ the Court still finds it prudent to issue this Order to provide clarity to the parties as to the status of the case and the next steps.

First, the Court would note that Respondent’s motion seeking an extension of time is/was a grantable motion. “OCAHO’s Rules of Practice and Procedure for Administrative Hearings do not provide specific standards for granting extensions, but the standard routinely applied is good cause.” *United States v. Space Exploration Techs. Corp.*, 18 OCAHO no. 1499, 5 (2023) (collecting cases and citing, inter alia, Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1) (“When an act may be or must be done within a specified time, the court may, for good cause, extend the time . . .”).⁴ The Court finds Respondent’s reasons for the extension to be sufficiently detailed and Respondent has demonstrated good cause. *See, generally United States v. Facebook, Inc.*, 14 OCAHO no. 1386, 3 (2021) (cautioning parties to provide “detailed rationale demonstrating good cause” for extension requests).

As to the request for a stay, the Court concludes that, while Respondent’s rationale is reasonable on its face, a stay is unnecessary based on the current phase of the litigation. Specifically, the parties were informed via the NOCA that they should not initiate discovery until provided with a discovery schedule by the presiding Administrative Law Judge (which has not yet happened). Further, the Court has yet to hold an initial prehearing conference with the parties setting other

² This is the date the filings were processed, and this date may not reflect when the motions were served on opposing counsel or sent to the Court. Indeed, portions of the motions make it appear as though these motions were at least placed in the mail in advance of the original answer deadline.

³ This is in no way a reflection on counsel; rather, it is purely a result of the delayed processing of filings post-shutdown.

⁴ 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 <http://www.justice.gov/eoir/OcahoMain/ocahosibpage.htm#PubDecOrders>.

deadlines in the case.⁵ Stated a different way, pre-answer, there is very little, if anything, to “stay.” In any event, the Court now provides the following revised deadlines and next steps for this case:

January 6, 2026	Prehearing Conference ⁶
January 13, 2026	Answer Deadline

SO ORDERED.

Dated and entered on December 17, 2025.

Honorable Andrea R. Carroll-Tipton
Administrative Law Judge

⁵ The conference is typically scheduled post-answer, although there are some instances, like this one, where the Court may engage pre-Answer in order to maximize communication with parties and ensure efficient case management.

⁶ In the prehearing conference, parties may make oral motions pertaining to deadlines (including the deadline to file an answer, or dispositive motions like motions to dismiss). Parties may also provide an update on their efforts to resolve the case.

The Court will contact the parties separately to arrange a specific time/ provide dial-in instructions for the conference.