

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

August 12, 2026

RAVI SHARMA,	)	
Complainant,	)	
	)	
	)	8 U.S.C. § 1324b Proceeding
v.	)	OCAHO Case No. 2026B00049
	)	
	)	
SYNOPSISYS, INC. AND INSIGHT GLOBAL,	)	
Respondent(s).	)	
	)	

Appearances: Ravi Sharma, pro se Complainant
Kathryn J. Cheatle, Esq., and Amy L. Peck, Esq., for Respondent Synopsisys, Inc.
Leon Rodriguez, Esq., and Christopher Laudenbach, Esq. for Respondent Insight
Global

NOTICE & ORDER DENYING COMPLAINANT’S MOTION FOR DEFAULT JUDGMENT
AND REQUIRING FILING PERTAINING TO DEFICIENT COMPLAINT

I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY AND FILINGS TO DATE

On June 8, 2026, Complainant filed a Complaint naming both Synopsisys, Inc and Insight Global as Respondent(s)¹ alleging citizenship discrimination based on his non-selection for a HAPS Prototyping Engineer position.²

¹ The Complaint notes Synopsisys is located in California, and Insight Global is located in a different location – Georgia. Compl. 5. A careful review of the Answers filed in this case causes the Court to conclude they hold themselves out to be two distinct businesses or entities.

² As is explained later in this Notice & Order, Complainant amended his Complaint to describe the position as “HAPS Prototyping Engineer/Application Engineer.”

In his Complaint, Complainant alleges he is a U.S. citizen or national who applied for a “HAPS Prototyping Engineer” position on March 13, 2025. Compl. 2, 7. The Complainant goes on to allege the “Business/Employer” refused to hire him because of his citizenship status.³ Compl. 7.

On June 22, 2026, the Office of the Chief Administrative Hearing Officer issued a Notice of Case Assignment (NOCA) (with Complaint attached) by mail to both Respondent businesses.

According to the USPS website, Respondent Insight Global received the NOCA and Complaint on June 26, 2026. Respondent Insight Global’s answer was due by July 26, 2026. 28 C.F.R. § 68.9(a); *United States v. TX Pollo Feliz*, 18 OCAHO no. 1503, 3 (2023).⁴

On July 21, 2026, Insight Global timely filed its Answer.

According to the USPS website, Respondent Synopsys, Inc. received the NOCA and Complaint on June 29, 2026. Respondent Synopsys, Inc.’s answer was due by July 29, 2026. 28 C.F.R. § 68.9(a); *United States v. TX Pollo Feliz*, 18 OCAHO no. 1503, 3 (2023).

On July 29, 2026, Synopsys, Inc. timely filed its Answer.

On August 6, 2026, Complainant filed a “Notice of First Amendment to the Original Complaint.” He also attaches his Amended Complaint.⁵ In his Notice, Complainant references Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a)(1)⁶ and informs the Court he “does not require leave to amend” because

³ Complainant alleges he spoke with individuals at each business about this position. Compl. 8.

⁴ 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>.

⁵ With his Notice, Complainant attaches his Amended Complaint, which is the OCAHO Complaint Form. At Section 7, when asked to “describe the job title and duties” Complainant amends his response to add “Application Engineer” such that the narrative response reads “HAPS Prototyping Engineer/ Application Engineer.” Amended Compl. 9.

He also checked boxes in Section 7 to affirm “the job remain[ed] open and the Business/Employer continue[d] taking applications from other people after you were not hired; [and]... someone else was hired for the job.” Amended Compl. 10.

⁶ As the Court has previously held:

OCAHO Rule 68.9(e) permits a complainant to amend a complaint “[if] a determination of a controversy on the merits will be facilitated thereby” and “upon such conditions as are necessary to avoid prejudicing the public interests and the rights of the parties[.]” The Court is therefore charged with balancing those interests in determining whether to allow the

he is filing his amendment within 21 days of receiving a responsive pleading. The timing of Complainant's amendment falls within the timeline provided for an "amendment as a matter of course;" thus, the Court will consider the Amended Complaint received on August 6, 2026 as the operative Complaint. *See* Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 15(a)(1).

Even with his amendments to the Complaint, Complainant does not resolve any of the deficiencies outlined below. Consequently, the flaws identified within this Order remain fatal to his now Amended Complaint.

On August 6, 2026, Complainant filed a "Motion to Enter Judgment Order Against Respondent Synopsys, Inc for Untimely Answer."⁷ In this Motion, Complainant (erroneously) noted the date Respondent Synopsys, Inc. was served with the Complaint as June 22, 2026. He then calculates a date of July 27, 2026 as the deadline by which the Answer was due. Next, he argues that an Answer, filed two days late (by his calculation), should result in default judgment. As the timeline in this Order makes clear, Respondent Synopsys Inc.'s Answer was timely filed.

Complainant's Motion (for Default Judgment) is DENIED.

II. THE AMENDED COMPLAINT DOES NOT MEET THE PLEADING STANDARD

A plain reading of the Amended Complaint causes the Court to surmise Complainant may have provided a singular application to what he believed was one discrete position or vacancy (and his eventual non-selection because of his citizenship status). Compl. 7-8. Indeed, he alleges the Respondent(s) hired "non-immigrant H1B/Optional Practical Training (OPT) workers" for the position at issue despite Complainant's qualifications. Compl. 8.

proposed amendment. *United States v. Sal's Lounge*, 15 OCAHO no. 1394, 1–2 (2020) (internal citations omitted).

OCAHO Rule 68.9(e) is "analogous to and is modeled upon Rule 15 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure," a permissible guidance in OCAHO proceedings, *see* 28 C.F.R. § 68.1. *United States v. Valenzuela*, 8 OCAHO no. 1004, 3 (1998). Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 15(a)(1) states that:

A party may amend its pleading once as a matter of course within: (A) 21 days after serving it, or (B) if the pleading is one to which a responsive pleading is required, 21 days after service of a responsive pleading or 21 days after service of a motion under Rule 12(b), (e), or (f), whichever is earlier.

Shater v. Shell Oil Company, 18 OCAHO no. 1504b, 2 (2024).

⁷ On August 11, 2026, Respondent Synopsys, Inc., filed an Opposition wherein it correctly calculated the number of days between its receipt of the Complaint and filing of the Answer. It also cited applicable regulation governing service and calculating time. Further, Respondent Synopsys, Inc. correctly interpreted OCAHO caselaw explaining when default judgment, a harsh remedy, is appropriate. Finally, Respondent Synopsys, Inc. attaches evidence to its Motion to support the factual assertions made therein.

Beyond that, it is unclear whether that application was received and evaluated by each of the two Respondent businesses (i.e. one application went to two different businesses, each with a vacancy), or whether Complainant attempted to allege something different. It is also unclear, based on the allegation, what the nature of the relationship between the two named Respondent businesses is.

Complainant must understand that, at this juncture, his Complaint does not meet the forum's pleading standard.⁸

Based on the Court's careful reading of the Complaint, there are too many unanswered questions regarding his application and non-selection for the vacancy (or vacancies). While Complainant is pro se, his Complaint must still provide sufficient detail so the Respondent (and the Court) can understand what allegedly transpired. Complainant must also understand that a complaint that fails to provide adequate notice may eventually be dismissed for failure to state a claim. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 68.10(b).

⁸ As the Court has previously held:

An OCAHO Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) may dismiss a complaint for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. 28 C.F.R. § 68.10(b). This rule is modeled after Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). *S. v. Discover Fin. Servs., LLC*, 12 OCAHO no. 1292, 7 (2016) (citing *United States v. Spectrum Tech. Staffing Servs., Inc.*, 12 OCAHO no. 1291, 8 (2016); and then citing 28 C.F.R. § 68.1). "In considering a motion to dismiss, the court must limit its analysis to the four corners of the complaint." *Udala v. New York State Dep't Educ.*, 4 OCAHO no. 633, 390, 394 (1994). The complainant's allegations of fact are accepted as true and all reasonable inferences derived therefrom are drawn in the complainant's favor. *Id.*

OCAHO's Rules of Practice and Procedure provide that complaints shall contain: (1) "A clear and concise statement of facts, upon which an assertion of jurisdiction is predicated"; (2) "The alleged violations of law, with a clear and concise statement of facts for each violation alleged to have occurred"; and (3) "A short statement containing the remedies and/or sanctions sought to be imposed against the respondent." 28 C.F.R. § 68.7(b)(1)-(4).

"Statements made in the complaint only need to be 'facially sufficient to permit the case to proceed further,' . . . as '[t]he bar for pleadings in this forum is low.'" *Sharma v. NVIDIA Corp.*, 17 OCAHO no. 1450, 3 (2022) (citing *United States v. Mar-Jac Poultry, Inc.*, 10 OCAHO no. 1148, 10 (2012), and then citing *United States v. Facebook, Inc.*, 14 OCAHO no. 1386b, 5 (2021)). "OCAHO's pleading standard does not require a complainant [to] proffer evidence at the pleadings stage . . . **Rather, pleadings are sufficient if 'the allegations give adequate notice to the respondents of the charges made against them.'**" *Id.* (quoting *Santiglia v. Sun Microsystems, Inc.*, 9 OCAHO no. 1097, 10 (2003)); *see also Mar-Jac Poultry, Inc.*, 10 OCAHO no. 1148, at 9.

US Tech Workers et al v. Gensler, 20 OCAHO no. 1587a, 7 (2024) (emphasis added).

III. COMPLAINANT ORDERED TO PROVIDE FURTHER INFORMATION

As the Court noted above, it is not clear why there are two businesses referenced throughout the Amended Complaint. To assist the Court in determining next steps, the Complainant is ORDERED by August 31 2026 to submit a filing explaining, at a minimum, whether he is alleging:

1. That each Respondent business had a “HAPS Prototyping Engineer/Application Engineer” vacant position (i.e. did Complainant apply to a vacancy at each business through one advertisement)?
2. That one business was a recruiter or staffing agency for the vacant position at the other?
3. That one business had a contractual arrangement with the other regarding employment matters (e.g. one is a contractor or subcontractor for the other)?
4. That there some other permutation not listed here that gives rise to his allegation(s) against each named Respondent?

Based on this submission, the Court will provide further instruction to Complainant, which may include providing leave to amend (for the second time) the Amended Complaint.⁹

Understandably, the Court does not expect either Respondent to suggest amendments to the Complaint; however, the Court does simultaneously invite Respondents to be heard on whether this case constitutes is an instance of misjoinder, and/or whether there is a claim to be severed (with the understanding these issues are not waived by declining to opine at this juncture).

Because there is much to resolve, the Court also requests Respondents refrain from filing an Amended Answer at this time. Once the path forward is more settled, the Court will provide Respondents with an opportunity to amend their Answers if they desire to do so.

All filings, required or otherwise, should be submitted by August 31, 2026 to be considered timely. Parties can anticipate further guidance from the Court depending on the content of those filings.

SO ORDERED.

Honorable Andrea R. Carroll-Tipton
Administrative Law Judge

⁹ When Rule 15(a)(1) does not apply, “[a] party may amend its pleading only with... the court’s leave. The court should freely give leave when justice so requires.” Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 15(a)(2).