

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

September 16, 2026

JOHN WEIS,	)	
	)	
Complainant,	)	
	)	8 U.S.C. § 1324b Proceeding
v.	)	
	)	OCAHO Case No. 2026B00060
ANCESTRY,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	
_____	)	

Appearances: John Weis, pro se Complainant
Esther Lander, Esq., for Respondent

ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO EXTEND DEADLINE FOR RESPONDENT’S ANSWER
TO COMPLAINT

This case arises under the antidiscrimination provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), as amended, 8 U.S.C. § 1324b. Complainant, John Weis, filed a complaint with the Office of the Chief Administrative Hearing Officer (OCAHO) on July 30, 2026. Complainant alleges that Respondent violated 8 U.S.C. § 1324b(a)(1). On September 9, 2026 Respondent filed a Motion to Extend Deadline for Respondent’s Answer to the 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.” *U.S. Tech Workers, et al. v. G2* 19 OCAHO no. 1569, 2 (2024)(citations omitted). Good cause exists where there is a “determination of good faith on the part of the party seeking an enlargement of time and some reasonable basis for non-compliance with the time specified in the rules”. *Id.*

Here, Respondent’s motion informs the Court that good cause exists to grant the requested extension given that the parties have reached a settlement agreement in principle and only seek the extension of time to complete the negotiation process. (Resp’t’s Mot. to Extend Deadline for Answer to Compl. 2-3.)

Additionally, the motion informs the Court that this motion is Respondent's first request, and if granted will not prejudice the Complainant. (Resp't's Mot. to Extend Deadline for Answer to Compl. 2-3.)

Lastly, Respondent's motion requests a 30 calendar day extension to answer the complaint by October 9, 2026, to allow sufficient time to finalize a settlement agreement and file a joint motion for dismissal if negotiations are successful. (Resp't's Mot. to Extend Deadline for Answer to Compl. 2-4.)

Parties' settlement discussions demonstrate good faith, an interest in resolving the case without delay and give rise to good cause to grant the motion. *See Regis v. Venture Logistics, LLC*, 19 OCAHO 1556 (2024). Given parties' ongoing settlement negotiations, the granting of a short extension does not prejudice any party and is reasonable and warranted under the circumstances. *Cf. United States v. Space Exploration Techs. Corp.*, 18 OCAHO no. 1499, 2023 WL 7288502, at *3 (2023) (granting 30-day extension when unlikely to substantially impact the proceedings and was the first such request).

Based upon the facts stated in the motion, the Court finds that good cause exists to grant the requested extension, and that the extension will not prejudice the Complainant.

Respondent's Motion is GRANTED. Respondent's answer is due by **October 9, 2026**.

SO ORDERED.

Honorable Paul M. Marian
Administrative Law Judge