

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION
Office of Administrative Law Judges

MAC INDUSTRIES INC. DBA MAC CONTAINER LINE,
Complainant

v.

COSCO SHIPPING LINES CO., LTD. AND
COSCO SHIPPING LINES (NORTH AMERICA) INC.,
Respondents.

DOCKET NO. 25-29

Served: January 15, 2026

ORDER OF: Erin M. WIRTH, *Chief Administrative Law Judge.*

ORDER ON MOTION TO EXTEND TIME TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT

On January 13, 2026, Respondents filed a motion for extension of time to respond to the complaint (“Motion”). Respondents seek a brief extension, from January 16, 2026, to January 23, 2026, to respond to the complaint. The motion states that Complainant was contacted and did not consent to the extension. The motion also requests that Complainant’s time to respond to the motion be shortened.

On January 14, 2026, an order was issued requiring that: “If Complainant intends to respond to the Motion, any response must be filed on or before January 15, 2026.” Later on January 14, 2026, an email was received from Complainant’s President, who is representing Complainant in this proceeding. The email stated:

MAC Industries Inc. dba MAC Container Line does not oppose Respondents’ Motion for Extension of Time to Respond. MAC reserves all rights with respect to the merits of the Complaint and all defenses thereto, and does not waive or concede any position by acquiescing to the requested extension. MAC appreciates the Court’s consideration and will proceed in accordance with any order issued.

January 14, 2026, email.

Respondents have provided good cause for the brief extension and Complainant does not oppose it. Accordingly, it is hereby ordered that the motion seeking an extension of time for Respondents to respond to the complaint be **GRANTED**. The deadline for Respondents’ responsive pleadings is extended to January 23, 2026.

The parties are encouraged to review the Initial Order issued in this proceeding. The Order requires that: “Any request for action by the Commission or presiding officer must be made by motion, not by letter or email request or as part of a joint status report.” Initial Order ¶ 17. This allows the filings to be properly put on the docket by the Office of the Secretary. *See* <https://www2.fmc.gov/readingroom/proceeding/25-29/>. The requirement is being waived for this one email in response to the motion. However, failure to follow the requirements in the Initial Order may result in future filings being rejected.


Erin M. Wirth
Chief Administrative Law Judge