

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

January 21, 2026

VARUN MANGEWALA,	)	
Complainant,	)	
	)	
	)	8 U.S.C. § 1324b Proceeding
v.	)	OCAHO Case No. 2024B00051
	)	
	)	
SAIL INTERNET INC.,	)	
Respondent.	)	
	)	

---

Appearances: Varun Mangewala, pro se Complainant  
Collin D. Cook, Esq., Eryne Walvekar, Esq., and Geoff Forney, Esq., for  
Respondent  
Erik Lang, Esq., for the United States

ORDER SUMMARIZING PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE & REFERRAL TO  
SETTLEMENT OFFICER PROGRAM

On January 21, 2026 the Court conducted a prehearing conference.

Respondent made an oral motion seeking withdrawal of counsel, and inclusion of new counsel. Complainant did not oppose the oral motion. The Court granted the Motion, and the appearances as annotated in this Order reflect Respondent’s motion.

Parties provided an update following participation in the Settlement Officer Program. Based on this update, the Court concluded a new referral to the Settlement Officer Program would benefit the parties. The parties concurred, and orally<sup>1</sup> consented to a new referral to the Program.

The Court now refers this case to the Settlement Officer Program for a period of sixty days, beginning on **January 21, 2026**. “[W]ith the consent of the parties, the settlement officer

---

<sup>1</sup> The Court exercised its discretion and permitted oral (vice written) consent to the Program, accounting for this Order memorializing such consent in writing, and the parties understanding of the Program, having previously participated.

may . . . seek an additional thirty (30) days” to the referral period. OCAHO Practice Manual Ch. 4.7 (Mar. 12, 2013).

The Court designates the Honorable John Henderson, as the Settlement Officer for this case.

Should the parties reach a settlement, they shall inform the Court of such settlement. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 68.14.<sup>2</sup> Specifically, the Court encouraged the parties to review and discuss 28 C.F.R. § 68.14(a)(1) and (2).<sup>3</sup> Specifically, the regulation at (a)(1) covers consent findings and the regulations at (a)(2) cover requests for only dismissal following settlement. Parties must ensure that, in either instance, they inform the Court of their position on “with or without” prejudice.

Il case deadlines are STAYED until further notice.

SO ORDERED.

Dated and entered on January 21, 2026.

---

Honorable Andrea R. Carroll-Tipton  
Administrative Law Judge

---

<sup>2</sup> OCAHO’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, 28 C.F.R. pt. 68 (2024). While in the Program, parties should continue to comply with any applicable regulations at 28 C.F.R. pt. 68.

<sup>3</sup> “Where the parties or their authorized representatives or their counsel have entered into a settlement agreement, they shall:

- (1) Submit to the presiding Administrative Law Judge:
  - (i) The agreement containing consent findings; and
  - (ii) A proposed decision and order; or

- (2) Notify the Administrative Law Judge that the parties have reached a full settlement and have agreed to dismissal of the action. Dismissal of the action shall be subject to the approval of the Administrative Law Judge, who may require the filing of the settlement agreement.