

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

April 4, 2025

QUN WANG,)	
Complainant,)	
)	
)	
v.)	8 U.S.C. § 1324b Proceeding
)	OCAHO Case No. 2025B00033
)	
)	
META PLATFORMS, INC.,)	
Respondent.)	
)	
<hr style="width: 100%;"/>)	

Appearances: Daniel Low, Esq., for Complainant
Eliza A. Kaiser, Esq., Matthew S. Dunn, Esq., and Amelia B. Munger, Esq., for Respondent

ORDER GRANTING RESPONDENT’S MOTION FOR EXTENSION (ANSWER)

On March 5, 2025, Complainant, Qun Wang, filed a complaint with the Office of the Chief Administrative Hearing Officer (OCAHO) against Respondent, Meta Platforms, Inc. The complaint alleges Respondent discriminated on the basis of citizenship status, in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1324b(a)(1)(B).

That same day, the Chief Administrative Hearing Officer sent a Notice of Case Assignment for Complaint Alleging Unfair Immigration-Related Employment Practices and a copy of the complaint to Respondent via U.S. certified mail. Based on the date of receipt, Respondent’s answer is due by April 17, 2025.

On April 2, 2025, Respondent filed an Unopposed Motion Requesting Extension of Time to Answer and Respond to Complaint, along with a Declaration of Eliza A. Kaiser. The motion requests a 30-day extension and includes proof Complainant does not oppose the extension. Mot. Ext. 1; Decl. Eliza A. Kaiser, Ex. A. “Respondent requests additional time so it may adequately investigate the claims in the Complaint for its answer and assess the possible merits of a motion to dismiss.” Mot. Ext. 1.

As Respondent correctly notes in its motion, the Court looks for good cause when granting extensions. Mot. Ext. 1 (quoting *Tingling v. City of Richmond*, 13 OCAHO no. 1324c, 2 (2021)).¹ The “good cause” standard can “consider the diligence of the party seeking the [change in deadlines].” *Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992).

While “seeking additional time to ‘research and assess the merits’ of . . . [a] potential motion,” may not always constitute good cause; here, the Court considered Respondent’s diligence in both bringing this issue expeditiously and obtaining the position of Complainant. Both serve as key factors in determining an extension is appropriate here. *See generally Wangperawong v. Meta Platforms, Inc.*, 18 OCAHO no. 1510, 2 (2023).

Accordingly, Respondent’s motion is GRANTED, and its answer is due by May 19, 2025.

Separately, the Court is attaching a copy of OCAHO’s Email Filing Program Registration Form and Certification.

SO ORDERED.

Dated and entered on April 4, 2025.

Honorable Andrea R. Carroll-Tipton
Administrative Law Judge

¹ Citations to OCAHO precedents in bound volumes one through eight include the volume and case number of the particular decision followed by the specific page in the bound volume where the decision begins; the pinpoint citations which follow are to the pages, seriatim, of the specific entire volume. Pinpoint citations to OCAHO precedents after volume eight, 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 through the Westlaw database “FIM OCAHO,” the LexisNexis database “OCAHO,” and on the United States Department of Justice’s website: <https://www.justice.gov/eoir/office-of-the-chief-administrative-hearing-officer-decisions>.