

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

April 2, 2026

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
K. Edward Raleigh, Esq., and Samantha Caesar, Esq., for Respondent

PREHEARING ORDER FIVE – ORDER SUMMARIZING PREHEARING CONFERENCE

On April 2, 2026, the Court held a prehearing conference.

I. HEARING LOGISTICS (LOCATION & START TIME)

At the last prehearing conference, the Court provided a location and start date for the hearing, and encouraged parties to meet and confer over additional hearing logistics.

The Court understands the parties desire a 10:00 am PST start time, and it is amenable to this request. Parties should anticipate a short comfort break at least hourly and a longer break for a meal.

The hearing will be conducted in Court Room #4 at:

San Francisco Immigration Court
100 Montgomery Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94104

II. PREHEARING STATEMENT REVIEW

In its January 15, 2025 Order, the Court outlined the requirements for the parties Prehearing Statements. The Parties were to provide a detailed witness list, a detailed exhibit list, and proposals regarding the Court's Findings of Fact (made following Summary Decision motion practice).

A. Complainant's Prehearing Statement

On May 15, 2025, Complainant submitted his Prehearing Statement (INDEX #80). Complainant lists 42 different numbered exhibits (some are already in the record¹ and some appear to be novel). Complainant also proposes witnesses, although some were the subject of denied subpoenas and some pertain to damages. (At a minimum, the Court anticipates Complainant will testify during its case in chief, and anticipates finalization of any additional witnesses at the next prehearing conference.) As to proposals pertaining to the Court's prior Findings of Fact, Complainant identifies the following:

1. Fact A.5 – The Fact states the application contains two optional screening questions about work authorization. Complainant contends these screening questions were not optional.²
2. Fact C.25 – The Fact identifies Complainant's interview date as March 1, 2021 and does not identify his interviewer. Complainant contends the interview occurred on February 26, 2021 and names the interviewer.³
3. Fact F.59 – The Fact identifies the offer date for C-827 as "unknown." Complainant contends the offer date was on or after February 23, 2021.⁴

B. Respondent's Prehearing Statement

On June 10, 2025, Respondent provided its Prehearing Statement (INDEX #82). Respondent lists Exhibits A-L. (some are already in the record⁵ and some appear to be novel). Respondent proposes four witnesses. As to proposals pertaining to the Court's prior Findings of Fact, Respondent identifies each at Attachment A of its prehearing statement.

¹ Offering these exhibits at hearing, even if they are duplicative, is consistent with the instructions provided by the Court.

² According to footnote 4 at page 3 of Respondent's Prehearing Statement (filed June 2, 2025), it would contest this proposed revision by Complainant.

³ According to footnote 4 at page 3 of Respondent's Prehearing Statement (filed June 2, 2025), it "generally agrees" with this proposed revision by Complainant.

⁴ According to footnote 4 at page 3 of Respondent's Prehearing Statement (filed June 2, 2025), it "generally agrees" with this proposed revision by Complainant.

⁵ Offering these exhibits at hearing, even if they are duplicative, is consistent with the instructions provided by the Court.

III. EXHIBITS & STIPULATION PLAN

The Court informed the parties each should review the proposed revisions or corrections offered by the other side and indicate whether a stipulation would be possible.

Consistent with its Prehearing Statement, Respondent indicated it can stipulate to two facts proposed by Complainant (C.25 and F.59 but not A.5).

Both sides shall have two weeks to consider the opposing sides proposed revisions or corrections to the findings of fact and provide a filing indicating whether it can or cannot stipulate to each listed fact.

By **April 16, 2026**, parties shall each file a “Status – Stipulations of Fact” (recognizing Respondent has already stipulated to facts during the conference – if its position remains unchanged it need not file this submission).

By **April 23, 2026**, parties shall exchange Exhibit Lists (do not file with the Court) to include any revisions or updates since their Prehearing Statements. For the week following April 23, 2026, parties shall meet and confer (to eliminate any duplicate exhibits, work through any points of disagreement to the extent possible etc.).

By **April 30, 2026**, parties shall each file a “Status – Proposed Exhibit List & Potential Objections” wherein it provides the Court with its Proposed Exhibit List, and then separately identifies the opposing party exhibits to which it intends to object at hearing (failure to list an exhibit does not constitute a waiver to object at hearing, rather this portion of the filing assists with planning).

IV. NEXT PREHEARING CONFERENCE

On **May 4, 2026** at 9:00 am PST, the Court will hold its next prehearing conference, during which it anticipates a discussion about witnesses, further comment on the order of operations⁶ (which remains flexible). The parties may join the conference call by dialing: [xxx-xxx-xxxx], using the meeting number: [xxx-xxx-xxx] and meeting password: [xxxx].

SO ORDERED.

Honorable Andrea R. Carroll-Tipton
Administrative Law Judge

⁶ The order in which parties will seek admission of exhibits, opening statement, and witness testimony.