

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. 2026B00004
)	
)	
UBER TECHNOLOGIES INC.,)	
Respondent.)	
)	

Appearances: Daniel Low, Esq., for Complainant
Molly Jennings, Esq., and April N. Williams, 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 November 14, 2025, Complainant filed a complaint with the Office of the Chief Administrative Hearing Officer (OCAHO) against Respondent.

On December 4, 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 December 11, 2025, making an answer due by January 10, 2026.

On December 15, 2025 the Court received Respondent’s Motion for Extension of Time to File Responsive Pleadings, seeking an extension to February 7, 2026. As to Complainant’s position, Respondent explained “Complainant’s counsel advised that they consent to the extension requested in this motion.”² Mot. Requesting Extension 1. As for the requisite good cause,

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

² As a courtesy, the Court will take Respondent at its word; however, it is a better practice to either file a joint motion (signed by both parties), or attach an exhibit evidencing non-opposition (i.e. a PDF of an email).

Respondent notes there are several holidays within the timeframe to file an answer, and counsel has planned periods of unavailability during this time. Respondent notes this is the first extension requested; it is unopposed; and Respondent has not acted in bad faith.

“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 . . .”).³

The Court finds Respondent’s reasons for the extension to be sufficiently detailed and Respondent has demonstrated good cause. *See, e.g., United States v. Facebook, Inc.*, 14 OCAHO no. 1386, 3 (2021) (cautioning parties to provide “detailed rationale demonstrating good cause” for extension requests).⁴

The Respondent shall file its Answer on or before February 7, 2026.

SO ORDERED.

Dated and entered on December 17, 2025.

Honorable Andrea R. Carroll-Tipton
Administrative Law Judge

³ 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>.

⁴ The Complaint involves allegations of discrimination and retaliation raised by one individual, and the parties presumably participated in some capacity (or had awareness of) the related Civil Rights Division’s Immigrant and Employee Rights Section investigation. Respondent does not articulate why this particular complaint requires additional response time (for example, due to the size, complexity, or novelty of the allegations). *Cf., e.g., United States v. Walmart Inc. (Bethlehem)*, 17 OCAHO no. 1475, 2 (2023) (finding good cause for an extension of time to file oppositions to motions to dismiss across twenty pending related cases).