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

October 23, 2026

RAVI SHARMA,	)	
	)	
Complainant,	)	
	)	8 U.S.C. § 1324b Proceeding
v.	)	
	)	OCAHO Case No. 2026B00072
ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC.,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	
	)	

Appearances: Ravi Sharma, pro se Complainant
Stephanie C. Generotti, Esq., and Stephen H. Smalley, Esq., for Respondent

ORDER GRANTING RESPONDENT'S UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINANT'S COMPLAINT

On September 15, 2026, Complainant Ravi Sharma filed a Complaint with the Office of the Chief Administrative Hearing Officer (OCAHO) against Respondent Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. Respondent received the Complaint on September 25, 2026. *See* Respondent's Unopposed Motion for Extension of Time to Respond to Complainant's Complaint (Motion). Under 28 C.F.R. §§ 68.8(a), 68.9(a), Respondent must file its answer to the Complaint by October 26, 2026.

On October 21, 2026, Respondent filed a motion for an extension of time until November 30, 2026, to file its answer to the Complaint.[1] This is Respondent's first motion for an extension of time to file the answer. Complainant does not oppose the Motion.

In its Motion, Respondent asserts that the extended time is for good cause and will not unduly delay the proceedings or prejudice either party. *See* Motion at 2. Specifically, Respondent explained that it recently retained counsel, who needs additional time to analyze the allegations in the Complaint, investigate and discuss the allegations with Respondent, and prepare a response. *Id* at 1. Respondent further indicated that the client contact at its business has a planned three-week period of medical leave that began on October 21, 2026. *Id.* at 2.

[1] Respondent requested a 30-day extension of time, plus six additional days in light of the Thanksgiving holiday. Motion at 2 n.1.

"OCAHO's Rules of Practice and Procedure for Administrative Hearings do not provide specific standards for granting extensions, but the standard routinely applied is good cause." *United States v. Space Exploration Techs.*, 18 OCAHO no. 1499, 5 (2023). "Good cause requires 'a demonstration of good faith on the part of the party seeking an enlargement of time and some reasonable basis for noncompliance with the time specified in the rule.'" *US Tech Workers v. Morningstar, Inc.*, 20 OCAHO no. 1603, 2 (2024) (quoting *Tingling v. City of Richmond*, 13 OCAHO no. 1324c, 2 (2021)).

Given Respondent's representations in its Motion, that Complainant does not oppose the Motion, and that this is Respondent's first request for an extension of time to file its answer, the Court finds that Respondent has demonstrated good cause and a reasonable basis for the extension of time.

Accordingly, Respondent's Unopposed Motion for Extension of Time to Respond to Complainant's Complaint is GRANTED, and Respondent's answer is due for filing with this Court no later than November 30, 2026.

SO ORDERED.

_____
Honorable Joanne E. Johnson
Administrative Law Judge