

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

June 30, 2025

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

Appearances: Robert J. Barton, Esq., and Marie-Lise Baroutjian, Esq., for Complainant
Patrick Shen, Esq., K. Edward Raleigh, Esq., and Samantha Caesar, Esq.,
for Respondent

ORDER GRANTING RESPONDENT MOTION FOR EXTENSION

On June 12, 2025, Complainant filed Complainant’s Motion for Jury Trial.

On June 17, 2025, Respondent filed Respondent’s Unopposed Motion to Extend Deadline to Respond to Complainant’s Motion for Jury Trial. Respondent argues “Complainant’s Motion raises novel legal issues not typically presented in OCAHO proceedings,” and a 14-day extension would allow Respondent to “present a thorough and well-reasoned response . . .” Mot. Extend Deadline 1-2. Respondent notes the request is unopposed.

“OCAHO’s Rules of Practice and Procedure . . . do not provide specific standard for granting extension, but the standard routinely applied is good cause.” *United States v. Zarco Hotels Inc.*, 18 OCAHO no. 1518c, 1 (2024) (quoting *US Tech Workers et al. v. Walgreens*, 19 OCAHO no. 1541, 2 (2024)).¹

¹ 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>.

The Court finds Respondent presents sufficient good cause, noting the length of the extension requested is reasonable, and Complainant does not oppose the motion.

Respondent's Unopposed Motion to Extend Deadline is GRANTED.

Respondent's response is now due on July 7, 2025.

SO ORDERED.

Dated and entered on June 30, 2025.

Honorable Andrea R. Carroll-Tipton
Administrative Law Judge