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

September 30, 2026

RAVI SHARMA, Complainant,	)	
v.	)	8 U.S.C. § 1324b Proceeding OCAHO Case No. 2026B00017
CISCO SYSTEMS, INC., Respondent.	)	

Appearances: Ravi Sharma, pro se Complainant
K. Edward Raleigh, Esq., Anna Perina, Esq., and Samatha Caesar, Esq., for Complainant

ORDER SUMMARIZING FOURTH PREHEARING CONFERENCE

I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On May 19, 2026, the Court conducted an initial prehearing conference.[1] During the conference, the Court informed the parties that Initial Disclosures would be required. The Court then set forth a detailed explanation with instructions regarding initial disclosures.

On June 22, 2026, Complainant filed a submission providing notice related to Initial Disclosures, discovery generally, and his desire to amend his Complaint.

[1] For reference, on August 20, 2026, the Court granted Complainant leave to amend his Complaint. The proposed amendment was timely filed on September 4, 2026. The allegation at issue is now:

> Complainant applied… for the job Hardware Engineer – FPGA on August 27, 2024… [He] was interviewed… on October 1, 2024… On October 2, 2024 [Complainant] received a voicemail… that [Respondent] was not interested [in hiring Complainant]… [Respondent] has hired H-1B visa candidates for the position… who [were] not equally qualified…

Amended Complaint 17-8.

On June 24, 2026, the Court held a second prehearing conference, during which it provided guidance to the parties on meeting and conferring during the proceedings. At the second prehearing conference, the Court placed limits on discovery. As the Court noted for the parties, it was mindful of the narrow nature of the allegation (non-selection (based on citizenship status) for a "Hardware Engineer – FPGA" job to which Complainant applied on August 27, 2024), and was aware some discoverable information had already provided through Initial Disclosures. With these datapoints in mind, the Court limited discovery in the following manner:

1. 10 (inclusive of subparts) interrogatories,
2. 10 (inclusive of subparts) requests for production,
3. 10 (inclusive of subparts) requests for admissions, and
4. 1 deposition.

On September 10, 2026 the Court held a third prehearing conference during which it discussed an issue of logistics pertaining to Complainant's deposition. After resolving the deposition logistics issue, the Court discussed the case deadlines with the parties.[2]

The Court explained that if either side desired additional discovery (and can demonstrate good cause as to the necessity of that additional discovery), they may file a written motion. Any such motion was due September 29, 2026.

Following that (third) prehearing conference, the Respondent filed its Notice Regarding Answer to Amended Complaint on September 23, 2026 (explaining that it would stand on its originally filed Answer).

On September 15, 2026, Complainant filed a "Motion to Redact Previously Submitted Exhibit 3." This Motion was unopposed. The Motion is GRANTED.

On September 25, 2026 Complainant filed its "Motion to Challenge the Protected Status of Information from a Different Case Used in This Case." On September 29, 2026, Respondent filed a Response.

The Court will adjudicate this Motion, and the parties agreed at the prehearing conference that the outcome of this issue would have no bearing on the discovery process in this case.

On September 29, 2026, Complainant filed a "Motion for Additional Discovery." Respondent is still within the "response window"[3] and will have an opportunity to provide a response in writing. Respondent's counsel previewed some concerns with the additional requests. Those concerns centered on relevance, with Respondent noting it had already (in its view) met its discovery obligations given the narrow scope of the case (i.e. it has turned over all information surrounding

[2] At that Conference, the Court also set a deadline for motions to compel; however, that deadline will be revised in light of the motion practice that followed.

[3] *See* 28 C.F.R. § 68.11(b) which states: "Within ten (10) days… after a written motion is served…, [a] party… may file a response in support of, or in opposition to, the motion…"

the requisition-numbered vacancy at issue.) This preview resulted in a brief discussion of relevance in discovery (contrasted with relevance in summary decision or at hearing).[4]

Because the Court permitted a preview of Respondent's position, and provided some additional information on relevance in discovery, it informed the parties it would permit Complainant to provide a reply filing (without seeking leave of court to do so). To ensure parity, the Court informed the parties that Complainant would have 10 days[5] from the date a Response is filed to submit his Reply (if he chooses to do so).

After this issue is fully briefed, the Court will issue an Order in which it will outline whether any additional discovery requested will be permitted. The outcome of that Order will further drive additional deadlines in this case (i.e. the "motion to compel" deadline). Parties can also anticipate a prehearing conference to be slated approximately a week before the "motion to compel" deadline.

As a final matter, the Court notes Complainant inquired about the deposition transcript, and Respondent's counsel indicated it would provide information on how to contact the court reporting company.

SO ORDERED.

Honorable Andrea R. Carroll-Tipton
Administrative Law Judge

[4] The Court informed the parties it would provide a case citation where relevance in discovery was analyzed. To that end, parties are encouraged to consider *United States v. Terrapower, LLC*, 19 OCAHO no. 1548f (2025). Available at: https://www.justice.gov/d9/2025-04/1548f.pdf

[5] This is the same number of days as is allotted a Response. 28 C.F.R. § 68.11(b).