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

October 7, 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 JOINT MOTION FOR DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE – FINAL ORDER

I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

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, which was granted by the Court based on representations that the parties were finalizing an agreement already reached in principle. On October 2, 2026, a Joint Motion For Dismissal With Prejudice was filed.

II. REVIEW OF THE JOINT MOTION

The Joint motion is filed by Mr. John Weis, the Complainant, and Ms. Esther Lander, Esq., on behalf of the Respondent, Ancestry.

The motion informs the Court that the parties "*have reached a full settlement of this matter, have entered into a mutually agreeable settlement agreement, and have agreed to dismissal of this action*." (Joint Mot. for Dismissal with Prejudice 1).

The motion further adds that "*the parties respectfully request that the Court dismiss the action with prejudice*." (Joint Mot. for Dismissal with Prejudice 2).

III. MOTION GRANTED; CASE DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE

The joint motion for dismissal is filed pursuant to 28 C.F.R. § 68.14(a)(2) which states that when a settlement agreement is reached, the parties shall "*[n]otify the Administrative Law Judge that the parties have reached a full settlement agreement and agreed to dismissal of the action. Dismissal of the action shall be subject to the approval of the Administrative Law Judge, who may require the filing of the settlement agreement*."

Here, the parties have informed the Court that a full settlement has been reached resulting in the joint request for the dismissal with prejudice of the case. While the settlement agreement may be required, the Court exercises its discretion in declining to do so in this case based upon the parties' representations in prior filings of due consideration of the issues, coupled with their ongoing negotiations preceding the filing of this case. The Court finds that the joint motion complies with the regulatory requirements of 28 C.F.R. § 68.14(a)(2).

Based upon the parties' compliance with the regulatory requirements, their joint motion is GRANTED, and the case is hereby DISMISSED with prejudice.

SO ORDERED.

Honorable Paul M. Marian
Administrative Law Judge

Appeal Information

This order shall become the final agency order unless modified, vacated, or remanded by the Attorney General. Provisions governing the Attorney General's review of this order are set forth at 28 C.F.R. pt. 68. Within sixty days of the entry of an Administrative Law Judge's final order, the Attorney General may direct the CAHO to refer any final order to the Attorney General for review, pursuant to 28 C.F.R. § 68.55.

Any person aggrieved by the final order has sixty days from the date of entry of the final order to petition for review in the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the violation is alleged to have occurred or in which the employer resides or transacts business. See 8 U.S.C. § 1324b(i)(1); 28 C.F.R. § 68.57. A petition for review must conform to the requirements of Rule 15 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.