

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

| | | |
|--|---|------------------------------|
| | * | |
| GAUTAM URS JAYARAMARAJEURS, | * | |
| Petitioner | * | |
| v. | * | CIVIL NO. JKB-15-1299 |
| DEPT. OF HOMELAND SECURITY, CITIZENSHIP & IMMIGR. SERVS., | * | |
| Respondent | * | |
| * * * * * | | |

MEMORANDUM

Pending before the Court is Petitioner’s amended petition for writ of mandamus in regard to Petitioner’s unsuccessful effort to get an extension of his immigration status for Optional Practical Training (“OPT”) in the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (“STEM”) field. (Am. Pet., ECF No. 15.) The specific relief requested is the following:

WHEREFORE, Petitioner requests that the Court issue a writ of mandamus ordering Respondent to explain why a decision setting forth the legal basis for the denial of the motion to reopen and reconsider the denial of the OPT STEM extension has not been issued and to issue a decision that includes evidence that the documentation submitted with the motion to reopen was considered and, if not found sufficient, why it was not sufficient to overcome any legal basis for the denial of the extension of OPT STEM status.

(Id. 4.)

Also pending before the Court is Respondent’s motion to dismiss or, in the alternative, for summary judgment. (ECF No. 17.) Respondent asserts the petition is moot as the relief requested has already been granted. (Mot. Supp. Mem. 1.) The Court agrees.

Included with the amended petition was an October 7, 2015, letter from Respondent to Petitioner. (Am. Pet., Ex. F.) In the letter, Respondent indicated its earlier letter communicating

the denial of Petitioner's OPT STEM extension contained typographical errors and contained an additional reason for the denial of the application that was not discussed in Respondent's initial notification of denial. (Id.) Consequently, Respondent had previously reopened the application and notified Petitioner of its intent to deny the application. (Id.) After allowing for receipt of additional materials from Petitioner, Respondent again denied the application, saying Petitioner's application was not approvable because it lacked the necessary recommendation from Petitioner's Designated School Official and because it was untimely filed. (Id.) In the roughly two and one half pages following that statement, Respondent explained the factual and legal basis for its decision. (Id.)¹

Thus, Petitioner has received all of the relief he requested in his petition, and this case is moot. A separate order will enter dismissing the case.

DATED this 13th day of March, 2016.

BY THE COURT:

/s/
James K. Bredar
United States District Judge

¹ The Court offers no opinion on the merits of Respondent's decision.