

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

June 24, 2026

MICHAEL BROWNE,	)	
Complainant,	)	
	)	
	)	
v.	)	8 U.S.C. § 1324b Proceeding
	)	OCAHO Case No. 2026B00039
	)	
	)	
LYFT, INC.,	)	
Respondent.	)	
	)	

Appearances: Ian B. Coleman, Esq., for Complainant
Esther Lander, Esq., for Respondent

ORDER DISCHARGING ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE & ORDER GRANTING EXTENSION
TO FILE AN ANSWER

On March 31, 2026, Mr. Browne filed his Complaint.

On May 18, 2026, the Court issued an Order to Show Cause as it had not received an answer.

On June 23, 2026 Respondent filed a Response to the Order to Show Cause and requested an extension to file its Answer. In its filing, Respondent explains (and provides evidence to prove) it received an incomplete copy of the Complaint (from Complainant) on June 4, 2026, and only saw the complete Complaint and other orders issued in the case after entering an appearance and gaining access to the OCAHO Portal. Resp. Order to Show Cause, 2-3. Further, Respondent was not aware of the matter pre-complaint because it was never informed by IER of the predicate investigation. *Id.* Respondent requests an extension of approximately 60 days (to August 24, 2026) to file its answer. *Id.* at 3.

The Court is satisfied with the Respondent's proffer and evidence supporting its assertions it had good cause for its failure to file an answer (as described above). *See generally Zajradhara v. Manbin Corp.*, 19 OCAHO no. 1553a, (2024).¹

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

As to its request for an extension, “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 Expl. Techs.*, 18 OCAHO no. 1499, 5 (2023); *see also US Tech Workers Et Al. v. G2*, 19 OCAHO no. 1569, 2 (2024). “Good cause requires a demonstration of good faith on the part of the party seeking an enlargement of time and some reasonable basis for noncompliance within the time specified in the rules.” *G2*, 19 OCAHO no. 1569, at 2 (quoting *Lowden v. Ann Arbor Elec. JATC Training Ctr.*, 18 OCAHO no. 1490, 2 (2023) (internal quotation marks omitted)).

Respondent has identified a reasonable basis for its request, as it has only recently been able to access the full Complaint and other orders issued in the case. Its request seems to contemplate access to the 30 days provided by regulation plus an additional 30 days. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 68.9(a).² Stated a different way, while the request is styled as a roughly 60 day extension, it is, practically, a request for only 30 days beyond the regulatory entitlement (as June 22, 2026 is the date on which the Respondent had access to the entire Complaint). Respondent demonstrated both diligence and good faith by filing its motion within days of access to the Complaint. Respondent’s request is reasonable under these circumstances. Granting this short extension will not prejudice Complainant. Finally, the record and these proceedings will benefit “by Respondent’s opportunity to file a meaningful answer.” *United States v. Brulotte Farms, Inc.*, 19 OCAHO no. 1527, 2 (2024).

Respondent’s motion is **GRANTED**, and Respondent’s answer is due by August 24, 2026.

SO ORDERED.

Honorable Andrea R. Carroll-Tipton
Administrative Law Judge

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 <https://www.justice.gov/eoir/office-of-the-chief-administrative-hearing-officer-decisions>.

² OCAHO Rules of Practice and Procedure, 28 C.F.R. pt. 68 (2024). The rules are also available through OCAHO’s webpage on the United States Department of Justice’s website. *See* <https://www.justice.gov/eoir/office-of-the-chief-administrative-hearing-officer-regulations>.