

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

AMANDEEP SHERGILL, MATHAVI  
VENKATESAN, SWATHI PEDDI,  
VENKATA YASESWINI MADHURI  
SURIVARAPU, PUJA PARIKH, NAGA  
BOBBILI, PAVANI KALLURU, DIVYA  
POTTI BALAJI, PRIYANKA BHATT,  
AYUSHI ARORA, RISHITHA  
KUNAPARAJU, SHASHANK  
KHANDELWAL, HARINI SEKAR, ZEB  
KHATIB, MARTYNA SZABADI,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ALEJANDRO MAYORKAS, Secretary of  
the Department of Homeland Security,

Defendant.

Case No. 21-cv-1296-RSM

**SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT**

This Settlement Agreement is entered into by and between Plaintiffs Amandeep Shergill, Mathavi Venkatesan, Swathi Peddi, Venkata Yaseswini Madhuri Surivarapu, Puja Parikh, Naga Bobbili, Pavani Kalluru, Divya Potti Balaji, Priyanka Bhatt, Ayushi Arora, Rishitha Kunaparaju, Shashank Khandelwal, Harini Sekar, Zeba Khatib, and Martyna Szabadi (“Plaintiffs”) and Defendant Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security

1 (“DHS”) Alejandro Mayorkas. Plaintiffs and Defendant are referred to collectively herein  
2 as the “Parties.” Out of a mutual desire to resolve the claims in the above-captioned case  
3 without need for further litigation and without admission of any liability, the Parties hereby  
4 stipulate and agree as follows:

5 **I. RECITALS**

6 1. Plaintiffs are fifteen noncitizens who each had a Form I-765 application for  
7 employment authorization pending before United States Citizenship and Immigration  
8 Services (“USCIS”), a component of DHS. Plaintiffs Khatib and Szabadi have sought  
9 employment authorization based on their valid L-2 status (“L-2 Plaintiffs”). The remaining  
10 Plaintiffs have standalone Forms I-765 seeking employment authorization and have valid H-  
11 4 status. (“H-4 Plaintiffs”).

12 2. On September 23, 2021, Plaintiffs filed this putative class action alleging,  
13 pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”), that USCIS unlawfully withholds  
14 employment authorization incident to status to L-2 Plaintiffs, or in the alternative,  
15 unlawfully withholds automatic extensions of L-2 employment authorization. They further  
16 allege that Defendant unlawfully withholds automatic extensions of employment  
17 authorization for H-4 Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs brought this action on behalf of themselves and  
18 all others who are similarly situated.

19 3. Although Plaintiffs’ Complaint was filed as a putative class action, no class  
20 has been certified.

21 4. Plaintiffs’ motion for a preliminary injunction is currently pending before the  
22 Court. Dkt. Nos. 4, 13-15.

23 5. USCIS has adjudicated all of Plaintiffs’ Forms I-765 except for those filed by  
24

1 Plaintiffs Venkatesan, Peddi, Kunaparaju, and Khandelwal, which are still pending.

2 5. The Parties wish to resolve the disputes that are the subject of this Action  
3 without the expense and drain on resources that may be associated with protracted litigation.

4 **II. TERMS OF THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT**

5 NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual promises set forth herein, the  
6 Parties agree as follows:

7 **A. Definitions**

8 For purposes of this Settlement Agreement, the following terms shall be defined as:

9 1. **Action:** The term “Action” means the lawsuit *Shergill, et al. v. Mayorkas*, No.  
10 21-cv-1295-RSM.

11 2. **CBP:** The term “CBP” means United States Customs and Border Protection.

12 3. **EAD:** The term “EAD” means an Employment Authorization Document on  
13 Form I-765.

14 4. **Effective Date:** The term “Effective Date” means the date this Settlement  
15 Agreement is executed by the Parties.

16 5. **List C Document:** The term “List C Document” means evidence of  
17 employment authorization listed as reflected on page 3 of Form I-9, Employment Eligibility  
18 Verification, pursuant to 8 CFR § 274a.2(b)(1)(v)(C).

19 6. **I-765 EAD renewal application:** The term “I-765 EAD renewal application”  
20 means Form I-765, Application for Employment Authorization, filed to request a renewal of  
21  
22  
23  
24

1 employment authorization and/or an EAD.

2 **B. The individuals covered by the Settlement Agreement are:**

- 3 1. L-2 nonimmigrants who are the spouse of an L-1 nonimmigrant; and  
4 2. Qualifying H-4 dependent spouses who a) properly file an application to  
5 renew their H-4 based EAD before it expires; b) have an unexpired Form I-94 showing their  
6 status as an H-4 nonimmigrant; and c) will continue to have H-4 status beyond the  
7 expiration date of their EAD.

8 **C. Automatic Renewals of Employment Authorization for applicants with  
9 valid H-4 status:**

10 1. USCIS will interpret 8 CFR § 274a.13(d) such that certain H-4 nonimmigrants  
11 who timely file their I-765 EAD renewal applications and continue to have H-4 status beyond the  
12 expiration date of their EAD qualify for the automatic extension of their (c)(26)-based  
13 employment authorization and EADs. Such auto-extensions terminate the earlier of: the end  
14 date of the individual's H-4 status as noted on Form I-94, the approval or denial of the Form I-  
15 765 EAD renewal application, or 180 days from the "Card Expires" date on the face of the  
16 EAD.

17 2. USCIS will issue appropriate guidance to employers and benefit granting  
18 agencies.

19 a. Such guidance will state that EAD auto-extensions apply to qualifying H-4  
20 nonimmigrants who continue to have H-4 status after their (c)(26) EAD expires.

21 b. To complete Form I-9, these individuals may present this combination of  
22 documents to their employers as an unexpired EAD as defined in 8 CFR §  
23 274a.13(d)(4): a facially expired EAD indicating Category C26; Form I-797C,  
24 Notice of Action for Form I-765 with Class requested indicating (c)(26) and

1 showing that the I-765 EAD renewal application was filed before the EAD  
2 expired; and unexpired Form I-94, Arrival-Departure Record showing valid H-4  
3 nonimmigrant status.

4 c. The employer would need to reverify work authorization at the earlier of  
5 the end date on Form I-94, date the I-765 is approved or denied, or the 180<sup>th</sup> day  
6 of the EAD auto-extension period.

7 3. Within 120 days of the Effective Date, USCIS will amend the receipt notice  
8 currently issued to applicants to detail the EAD auto-extension eligibility for those holding H-4  
9 status based on the validity period provided on a Form I-94 in combination with a facially  
10 expired EAD and the Form I-797C receipt notice for a timely-filed I-765 EAD renewal  
11 application.

12 **D. Employment Authorization Incident to Valid L-2 status and Automatic**  
13 **Extensions of EADs:**

14 1. USCIS will issue policy guidance that states that L-2 spouses are employment  
15 authorized incident to status and, in cooperation with CBP, change the Form I-94, within 120  
16 days of the Effective Date, to indicate that the bearer is an L-2 spouse so that it can be used as a  
17 List C document for Form I-9 purposes.

18 2. USCIS will interpret 8 CFR § 274a.13(d) such that certain L-2 nonimmigrant  
19 spouses who timely file their I-765 EAD renewal applications and continue to have L-2 status  
20 beyond the expiration date of their EAD qualify for the automatic extension of their (c)(18)-  
21 based EADs. The auto-extension would terminate the earlier of: the end date of the individual's  
22 L-2 status, the approval or denial of the I-765 EAD renewal application, or 180 days from the  
23 "Card Expires" date on the face of the EAD.

1           3.       USCIS will issue appropriate guidance to employers and benefit granting agencies  
2 regarding its interpretation of 8 CFR § 274a.13(d) outlined above as it relates to L-2 dependent  
3 spouses.

4           a.       Such guidance will state that EAD auto-extensions apply to L-2  
5 nonimmigrants who continue to have L-2 status after their (a)(18) EAD expires.

6           b.       To complete Form I-9, these individuals may present this combination of  
7 documents to their employers as an unexpired EAD as defined in 8 CFR §  
8 274a.13(d)(4): a facially expired EAD indicating Category A18; Form I-797C,  
9 Notice of Action for Form I-765 with “Class requested” indicating “(a)(18)” and  
10 showing that the I-765 EAD renewal application was filed before the EAD  
11 expired; and unexpired Form I-94, Arrival-Departure Record, showing valid L-2  
12 nonimmigrant status.

13           c.       The employer would need to reverify work authorization at the earlier of  
14 the end date on Form I-94, date the I-765 is approved or denied, or the 180<sup>th</sup> day  
15 of the EAD auto-extension period.

16           4.       Until the Form I-94 is changed to identify that the bearer is an L-2 spouse, for I-9  
17 purposes, it will not be sufficient evidence of employment authorization acceptable under List C  
18 of Form I-9. L-2 spouses with pending renewal EAD applications may, however, receive  
19 automatic extensions of their EADs and present the combination of documents described above  
20 to their employers to satisfy Form I-9 requirements.

21           **E.       Release: Scope and Effect of Release**

22           As of the Effective Date, Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves, their heirs, executors,  
23 administrators, representatives, attorneys, successors, assigns, agents, affiliates, and  
24

1 partners, and any person they represent, fully, finally, and forever release, relinquish, and  
2 discharge Defendant of and from any and all claims brought in this Action. The foregoing  
3 release includes all claims for injunctive or declaratory relief, whether known or unknown,  
4 that could have been brought on behalf of a putative class at any time prior to the Effective  
5 Date.

6 **F. Additional Provisions:**

7 1. This Settlement Agreement is not, is in no way intended to be, and should not  
8 be construed as, an admission of liability or fault on the part of DHS and its components,  
9 agents, representatives, or employees, and it is specifically denied that USCIS has  
10 unlawfully withheld employment authorizations or EADs to qualifying H-4 or L-2 spouses.  
11 This Settlement Agreement is entered into by the Parties for the purpose of compromising  
12 disputed claims and avoiding the expenses and risks of further litigation.

13 2. This Settlement Agreement does not limit DHS or any of its component  
14 agencies from interpreting any of their regulations in accordance with the Immigration and  
15 Nationality Act.

16 3. This Settlement Agreement does not limit USCIS's authority to implement  
17 new regulations, policies or practices concerning employment authorizations for qualifying  
18 noncitizens with valid H-4 status or valid L-2 status. Furthermore, this Settlement  
19 Agreement may be superseded by future regulatory action or Act of Congress.

20 4. The Parties agree to bear their own costs and attorneys' fees.

21 5. This Settlement Agreement and obligations incurred herein, shall be in full  
22 and final disposition of the Action with prejudice.

23 6. Within a reasonable time following execution of this Settlement Agreement,  
24

1 the Parties shall file a joint motion asking the Court to dismiss the case against Defendant  
2 with prejudice.

3 7. The provisions of this Settlement Agreement embody and reflect the entire  
4 understanding of the Parties and there are no representations, warranties, or undertakings  
5 other than those expressed and set forth herein. The provisions of this Settlement  
6 Agreement shall not be modified or amended in any way except by writing signed by all  
7 parties.

8 8. It is contemplated that this Settlement Agreement may be executed in several  
9 counterparts, with a separate signature page for each party. All such counterparts and  
10 signature pages, together, shall be deemed to be one document.

11 9. The persons signing this Settlement Agreement warrant and represent that  
12 they possess full authority to bind the persons and entities on whose behalf they are signing  
13 to the terms of the settlement.

14 DATED: November 10, 2021

15 /s/Kripa Upadhyay  
16 KRIPA UPADHYAY  
17 ORBIT LAW, PLLC  
2459 152nd Avenue NE, Suite 17-2459  
18 Redmond, WA 98052  
206-623-3352  
[kripa@orbitlawpllc.com](mailto:kripa@orbitlawpllc.com)

19 /s/Jonathan D. Wasden  
20 JONATHAN D. WASDEN  
21 WASDEN BANIAS, LLC  
38 Romney Street, Suite 201  
22 Charleston, SC 29403  
(P) 843.410.9340  
(F) 703.842.8273  
[jdwasden@wasdenbanias.com](mailto:jdwasden@wasdenbanias.com)

23 *Admitted Pro Hac Vice*



*Jesse Bless*  
JESSE M. BLESS

Director of Litigation  
American Immigration Lawyers Association  
1331 G Street NW, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 2005  
Phone: 202-507-7600  
Fax: 202-783-7853  
[jbless@aila.org](mailto:jbless@aila.org)

*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*

STEVEN A. BROWN  
REDDY & NEUMANN, P.C.  
11000 Richmond Avenue, Suite 600  
Houston, Texas 77042  
(713) 429-4793 Voice  
(713) 953-7797 Fax  
[steven@rnlawgroup.com](mailto:steven@rnlawgroup.com)

*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*

***Attorneys for Plaintiffs***

NICHOLAS W. BROWN  
United States Attorney

*Michelle R Lambert*  
MICHELLE R. LAMBERT, NYS #4666657  
Assistant United States Attorney  
United States Attorney's Office  
1201 Pacific Avenue, Suite 700  
Tacoma, WA 98402  
Phone: 253-428-3824  
Fax: 253-428-3826  
E-mail: [michelle.lambert@usdoj.gov](mailto:michelle.lambert@usdoj.gov)

11/10/2021

Date

***Attorneys for Defendant***