

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

August 22, 2011

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

---

No. 10-60931  
Summary Calendar

---

PADMANABHAN RAGHUNANDHAN,

Petitioner Cross-Respondent,

versus

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING OFFICER,

Respondent,

SATYAM COMPUTER SERVICES, LIMITED,

Respondent Cross-Petitioner.

---

Appeals from the United States Department of Justice,  
Executive Office for Immigration Review,  
Office of the Administrative Hearing Officer  
No. 10B00010

---

Before REAVLEY, SMITH, and PRADO, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

---

\* Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

No. 10-60931

Padmanabhan Raghunandhan petitions for review of an order of the Office of the Chief Administrative Hearing Officer (“OCAHO”) granting a summary decision for Satyam Computer Services, Limited (“Satyam”), and dismissing Raghunandhan’s claim of citizenship status discrimination and retaliation in violation of 8 U.S.C. §§ 1324b(a)(i)(B) and 1324(a)(5). Satyam cross-petitions under 8 U.S.C. § 1324b(j), asking that we enforce OCAHO’s final order dismissing Raghunandhan’s claim.

OCAHO issued a twenty-three page opinion with its order, addressing every aspect of the case. After reviewing the record, briefs, and applicable law, we deny Raghunandhan’s petition and grant Satyam’s cross-petition on the basis of OCAHO’s comprehensive opinion. Raghunandhan has not raised a genuine issue of material fact that his employment was terminated on the basis of his status as a U.S. citizen. To the contrary, the record shows that he was terminated because he refused to return to India when Satyam, because of economic concerns, canceled his temporary assignment as an Onsite Program Manager in the United States. Raghunandhan contends that Satyam’s action violated his employment agreement, but any issue of breach of contract is not before us.

Raghunandhan also contests the denial of his motion to compel discovery, but OCAHO appropriately denied that motion for failure to comply with the procedural requirements of 28 C.F.R. § 68.23(b)(4). Consequently, we DENY Raghunandhan’s petition for review of the OCAHO’s order and GRANT Satyam’s cross-petition seeking enforcement of that order.