

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

ISABEL MARIA PARRA GUERRERO,)	
Complainant,)	
)	
)	8 U.S.C. § 1324b Proceeding
v.)	OCAHO Case No. 2023B00048
)	
HIREMADSKILLS, INC.,)	
D/B/A INSTANT TEAMS, ¹)	
Respondent.)	
)	

Appearances: Isabel Maria Parra Guerrero, pro se Complainant
Brian A. Scotti, Esq., and Jeremy Ritter-Wiseman, Esq., for Respondent

ORDER GRANTING EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE ANSWER

This case arises under the antidiscrimination provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), as amended, 8 U.S.C. § 1324b. On March 6, 2023, Complainant Isabel Maria Parra Guerrero filed a complaint with the Office of the Chief Administrative Hearing Officer (OCAHO), alleging that Respondent, HireMadSkills, Inc. d/b/a Instant Teams, discriminated against her on account of citizenship status, in violation of § 1324b(a)(1).

On April 17, 2023, the Court received Respondent's Notice of Appearance. Pursuant to 28 C.F.R. § 68.33(f),² Brian Scotti, Esq. and Jeremy Ritter-Wiseman are now the attorneys of record for Respondent.

On April 17, 2023, the Court also received Respondent's Motion to Extend Response Deadline. Respondent requests an extension of time to file an answer because, inter alia, its newly retained counsel need additional time to respond to the complaint.

¹ The April 17, 2023 filings state that the correct name for Respondent is "HireMadSkills, Inc. d/b/a Instant Teams," and not "Instant Tears." Upon further review, the Court AMENDS the case caption to indicate Respondent's correct name, "HireMadSkills, Inc. d/b/a Instant Teams."

² OCAHO Rules of Practice and Procedure, 28 C.F.R. pt. 68 (2023).

“OCAHO rules do not provide specific standards for granting extensions [of time], but the standard routinely applied is good cause.” Tingling v. City of Richmond, 13 OCAHO no. 1324c, 2 (citations omitted).³ 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.” Id. (citations omitted).

The Court finds that Respondent proffered sufficient good cause for the sought extension. Moreover, Respondent requested additional time to file an answer before the original deadline. The Court therefore GRANTS Respondent an extension of time to file an answer. Respondent’s answer is now due on May 22, 2023.

The Court also notes that in its submission, Respondent indicated that the U.S. Department of Justice Immigrant and Employee Rights Section (IER) does not oppose the extension request. However, IER is not a party to this litigation. To the extent that IER seeks to intervene, or to otherwise appear on behalf of Complainant in this matter, the government shall follow the applicable OCAHO rule. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 68.15 (intervenors); § 68.33f (notices of appearance); *see also* Heath v. Niha Techs., Inc., 16 OCAHO no. 1427c, 1 n.1 (2022) (citations omitted); Zakarneh v. Intel Corp., 16 OCAHO no. 1414a, 2–3 (2022) (citations omitted).

SO ORDERED.

Dated and entered on May 10, 2023.

Honorable John A Henderson
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 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 “FIM-OCAHO,” or in the LexisNexis database “OCAHO,” or on the website at <http://www.justice.gov/eoir/OcahoMain/ocahosibpage.htm#PubDecOrders>.