

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

April 2, 2026

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 – AMENDED ANSWER

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 February 6, 2026, Respondent filed a Motion to Dismiss, which ultimately identified deficiencies in some (but not all) allegations in the Complaint – resulting in the provision of leave to amend the Complaint. In its Order, the Court noted the Complainant could submit a proposed amendment by March 18, 2026 and Respondent would have 14 days to submit a Motion to Dismiss or an Answer. The Court further noted the Respondent could file a motion requesting an extension to file its amended answer should it file a second motion to dismiss.

On March 18, 2026, Complainant filed its Amended Complaint.

On April 1, 2026, Respondent filed a Motion to Dismiss and a motion seeking an extension of its deadline to file an amended answer. Specifically, Respondent seeks a revised deadline predicated on the Court’s ruling on its motion to dismiss (14 calendar days following resolution of the motion). As for good cause, Respondent notes the resolution of the motion may inform its response to the Amended Complaint.

“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”)).¹

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). Further, Respondent’s request is consistent with the Court’s prior guidance.

The Respondent shall file its Amended Answer 14 calendar days after the Court issues an Order resolving its Motion to Dismiss..

SO ORDERED.

Honorable Andrea R. Carroll-Tipton
Administrative Law Judge

¹ 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>.