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

May 12, 2025

RAVI SHARMA, Complainant,)	8 U.S.C. § 1324b Proceeding
V.)	OCAHO Case No. 2022B00023
)	
NVIDIA CORP.,)	
Respondent.)	
)	

Appearances: Ravi Sharma, pro se Complainant¹

Patrick Shen, Esq., K. Edward Raleigh, Esq., and Samantha Caesar, Esq.,

for Respondent

ORDER DENYING COMPLAINANT'S MOTION FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS & CONVERSION TO E-FILING STATUS

On February 2, 2022, Complainant, Ravi Sharma, filed a complaint with the Office of the Chief Administrative Hearing Officer (OCAHO), and on March 15, 2022, Respondent filed an Answer.

In 2022, parties were actively engaged in discovery. *Sharma v. NVIDIA Corp.*, 17 OCAHO no. 1540a (2022).²

¹ Complainant's motion for production of documents was filed on January 27, 2025, at which time Complainant was pro se. On May 8, 2025, Robert J. Barton and Marie-Lise Baroutjian, filed Notices of Appearance (to appear on behalf of Complainant). Appearances in this Order reflect status at the time of the filing. Complainant's counsel have provided e-filing registration forms.

² 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 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 in the Westlaw database "FIMOCAHO," or in the LexisNexis database "OCAHO," or on the website at https://www.justice.gov/eoir/office-of-the-chief-administrative-hearing-officer-decisions.

17 OCAHO no. 1450q

On November 22, 2022, Complainant filed a motion which caused the Court to grant Complainant a discovery deadline extension (60 additional days) to continue to engage with Respondent on discovery. *Sharma*, 17 OCAHO no. 1540a, at 2, 4.

In January 2023, the Court adjudicated Complainant's motion to compel. *Sharma v. NVIDIA Corp.*, 17 OCAHO no. 1450d (2023). The Court held "Respondent has met its discovery obligations;" and Complainant did not provide sufficient good cause to justify additional interrogatories or production of documents. *Id.* at 5, 10. The Order relayed the discovery window "remained open through February 6, 2023." *Id.* at 11.

On March 13, 2023, Respondent (timely) filed a motion for summary decision.

On November 21, 2024, the Court adjudicated the Motion for Summary Decision, *Sharma v. NVIDIA Corp.*, 17 OCAHO no. 1450*l* (2024), and for the reasons outlined in that Order, the case was advanced to the pre-hearing phase. *Sharma v. NVIDA Corp.*, 17 OCAHO no. 1450m (2024); *Sharma v. NVIDIA Corp.*, 17 OCAHO no. 1450n (2025).

On January 27, 2025, Complainant filed a "Motion for Production of Documents," which is functionally a motion to compel.

Complainant, the moving party, offers no good cause as to why the Court should compel discovery 721 days after the discovery window closed, and over 650 days after Complainant responded to summary decision. Granting such a motion would be incredibly disruptive to the litigation and unequivocally prejudicial to Respondent, who has "already met its discovery obligations."

The motion is DENIED.

Due to the procedural phase of this litigation (pre-hearing), and the status of parties (i.e. all parties are now represented), this case shall be formally converted to e-filing status. If you have any questions about how to e-file, please contact Court Staff at [xxxxx.xxxxx].

SO ORDERED.

Dated and entered on May 12, 2025.

Honorable Andrea R. Carroll-Tipton Administrative Law Judge