

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

May 20, 2025

ARTIT WANGPERAWONG,)	
Complainant,)	
)	
v.)	8 U.S.C. § 1324b Proceeding
)	OCAHO Case No. 2024B00007
)	
META PLATFORMS, INC.,)	
Respondent.)	
_____)	

Appearances: Artit Wangperawong, pro se Complainant
Eliza A. Kaiser, Esq., Matthew S. Dunn, Esq., and Amelia B. Munger, Esq., for
Respondent

ORDER SUMMARIZING PREHEARING CONFERENCE – DISCOVERY CONFERENCE 1

The Court held a prehearing conference on May 20, 2025.

In its April 24, 2025 Order, the Court outlined the three remaining claims against Respondent: one “original” claim, and two “new” claims. *Wangperawong v. Meta Platforms, Inc.*, 18 OCAHO no. 1510l, 12 (2025).

Some discovery had transpired as to the “original” claim (but was not yet concluded).

Discovery had yet to commence for the “new” claim.

No depositions were taken. None will be noticed or taken until the Court determines the first phase of discovery is complete.

The Court noted Complainant had a pending Motion to Compel, filed on November 14, 2024. After providing Complainant with an opportunity to be heard, the Court DENIED the motion as MOOT. The Court explained to Complainant that the revised discovery schedule might cause the parties to resolve some of the disputes outlined in the motion, and he could file a revised motion should there be any unresolved discovery disputes pertaining to his original claim.

After hearing from the parties, the Court set forth the following schedule and construct for “written” or “documentary” discovery.

I. WRITTEN/ DOCUMENTARY DISCOVERY SCHEDULE FOR ORIGINAL CLAIM

Parties had previously propounded discovery on the original claim, and had not fully resolved issues related to that discovery. No depositions had been taken regarding the original claim.

By June 20, 2025 Parties shall conclude meet and confer efforts¹ on pending requests (including conducting an audit of outstanding requests).
 By July 7, 2025² Parties shall conclude the exchange of any outstanding requested matters.
 By July 25, 2025 Parties shall conclude meet and confer efforts on remaining areas of dispute.
 By August 25, 2025 Parties shall file any discovery-related motions pertaining to “old” requests.

II. WRITTEN/DOCUMENTARY DISCOVERY SCHEDULE FOR NEW CLAIMS

This is the first opportunity for parties to propound discovery related to the two new claims. After discussion with the parties, the Court determined discovery shall be limited to 25 requests for production, 25 requests for admission, 25 interrogatories, and 5 depositions.

By July 7, 2025 Parties must initiate discovery (i.e. serve a discovery request). Note that neither party is obligated to “use” all their requests by this date, rather they must initiate discovery by this date.
 By July 25, 2025 Parties shall conclude meet and confer efforts on these discovery requests.
 By Sept 26, 2025 Parties shall conclude the exchange of any requested matters.
 By October 27, 2025 Parties shall conclude meet and confer efforts on remaining areas of dispute.
 By December 1, 2025 Parties shall file any discovery-related motions pertaining to “new” requests.

III. PREHEARING CONFERENCE (DISCOVERY STATUS)

The Court will hold a status conference on **July 17, 2025, at 8:00 am PST**. Parties should anticipate discussion of (at a minimum) the following:

1. As to the “original” claim discovery, what is the scope and nature of any foreseeable discovery disputes. The Court may be amenable to limited oral motion practice.
2. As to the “new” claims discovery, what was propounded (volume and type, not substance).

¹ This means parties should begin these efforts as soon as practicable to ensure there is time for meaningful back and forth, client consultation, etc. in advance of the date listed.

² The Court framed these dates in discussions with the parties as “[number of] days out;” the dates here are calculated to ensure deadlines to not fall on weekends, and to account for holidays.

IV. PRECEDENTIAL CASES REFERENCED

Because Complainant is pro se, the Court engaged in a discussion during the conferences about helpful precedential cases. The cases provided here are not intended to be an exhaustive list or a closed universe of precedential cases on any particular topic; rather, they may serve as a helpful starting point in building a knowledge base for discovery and pre-hearing issues.

Discovery cases referenced include: *United States v. Terrapower, LLC*, 19 OCAHO no. 1548f (2025); *Saini v. Sheridan Cmty. Hosp.*, 21 OCAHO no. 1644c (2025); and *Sharma v. NVIDIA Corp.*, 17 OCAHO no. 1450d (2023).

The summary decision case referenced was: *Sharma v. NVIDIA Corp.*, 17 OCAHO no. 1450l (2024).

The full hearing case referenced was: *Zajradhara v. Ranni's Corp.*, 16 OCAHO no. 1426h (2024).

SO ORDERED.

Dated and entered on May 20, 2025.

Honorable Andrea R. Carroll-Tipton
Administrative Law Judge