BEFORE THE
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of: PARENT ON BEHALF OF STUDENT, v. LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT.	OAH Case No. 2018080963 ORDER FINDING COMPLAINT SUFFICIENTLY PLEADED

On August 23, 2018, Parent on behalf of Student filed a due process hearing request[1] (complaint) with the Office of Administrative Hearings naming Los Angeles Unified School District.

On October 2, 2018, Los Angeles filed a motion to dismiss, asserting that Student fails to allege that he is disabled or denied a free appropriate public education, and so cannot state a claim under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. § 1400, et seq.). Los Angeles also argues that Student seeks monetary damages, and does not allege relief available under the IDEA. Los Angeles' motion attacks the sufficiency of Student's pleadings, and so is treated as a notice of insufficiency.

APPLICABLE LAW

The named parties to a due process hearing request have the right to challenge the sufficiency of the complaint. (20 U.S.C. § 1415(b) & (c).) The party filing the complaint is not entitled to a hearing unless the complaint meets the requirements of title 20 United States Code section 1415(b)(7)(A).

The complaint is deemed sufficient unless a party notifies OAH and the other party in writing within 15 days of receiving the complaint that the party believes the complaint has not met the notice requirements. (20 U.S.C. § 1415(c)(2)(C); Ed. Code, § 56502, subd. (d)(1).)

A complaint is sufficient if it contains: (1) a description of the nature of the problem of the child relating to the proposed initiation or change concerning the identification,

[1] A request for a due process hearing under Education Code section 56502 is the due process complaint notice required under title 20 U.S.C. section 1415(b)(7)(A).

evaluation, or educational placement of the child, or the provision of a free appropriate public education to the child; (2) facts relating to the problem; and (3) a proposed resolution of the problem to the extent known and available to the party at the time. (20 U.S.C. § 1415(b)(7)(A)(ii)(III) & (IV).) These requirements prevent vague and confusing complaints, and promote fairness by providing the named parties with sufficient information to know how to prepare for the hearing and how to participate in resolution sessions and mediation. (See H.R.Rep. No. 108-77, 1st Sess. (2003), p. 115; Sen. Rep. No. 108-185, 1st Sess. (2003), pp. 34-35.)

The complaint provides enough information when it provides "an awareness and understanding of the issues forming the basis of the complaint." (Sen. Rep. No. 108-185, *supra*, at p. 34.) The pleading requirements should be liberally construed in light of the broad remedial purposes of the IDEA and the relative informality of the due process hearings it authorizes. (*Alexandra R. ex rel. Burke v. Brookline School Dist.* (D.N.H., Sept. 10, 2009, CIV. 06-CV-0215-JL) 2009 WL 2957991[nonpub. opn.]; *Escambia County Bd. of Educ. v. Benton* (S.D. Ala. 2005) 406 F.Supp.2d 1248, 1259-1260; *Sammons v. Polk County School Bd.* (M.D. Fla., Oct. 28, 2005, 8:04CV2657T24EAJ) 2005 WL 2850076 [nonpub. opn.]; but cf. *M.S.-G v. Lenape Regional High School Dist. Bd. of Educ.* (3d Cir. 2009) 306 Fed.Appx. 772, 775 [nonpub. opn.].) Whether the complaint is sufficient is a matter within the sound discretion of the Administrative Law Judge. (*Assistance to States for the Educ. of Children with Disabilities & Preschool Grants for Children with Disabilities* (Aug. 14, 2006) 71 FR 46,540-46541, 46699.)

DISCUSSION

Student's complaint alleges claims of inappropriate bullying, harassment, improper enrollment conduct and discrimination. Each of these actions would support a claim of denial of FAPE with additional allegations explaining Student's disability(ies), educational needs and how they were adversely impacted by Los Angeles' actions. For example, Student alleges that Los Angeles kept him out of school by disallowing enrollment, which would effectively deny a child with a disability of educational benefit.

Student's complaint does not allege relief available under the IDEA, but federal and state courts have broad equitable powers to remedy the failure of a school district to provide a FAPE to a disabled child. (20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(1)(C)(iii); Ed. Code, § 56505, subd. (g); see *School Committee of the Town of Burlington, Massachusetts v. Dept. of Education* (1985) 471 U.S. 359, 369.) This broad equitable authority extends to an ALJ who hears and decides a special education administrative due process matter. (*Forest Grove School Dist. v. T.A.* (2009) 557 U.S. 230, 244, n. 11.)

Los Angeles failed to raise the sufficiency of Student's pleading within 15 days of receiving Student's complaint, and therefore, Student's complaint is deemed sufficiently pleaded as a matter of law. Los Angeles failed to provide an explanation of why it did not file a timely NOI, or why Student's complaint should not be deemed sufficient.

Accordingly, Los Angeles' motion is denied as untimely.

ORDER

1. The complaint is also deemed sufficient under title 20 United States Code section 1415(c)(2)(C) and Education Code section 56502, subdivision (d)(1).

2. All prehearing conference and hearing dates in this matter are confirmed.

DATE: October 4, 2018

DocuSigned by:
Alexa Hohensee
A7D463EE094544B...

ALEXA J. HOHENSEE
Administrative Law Judge
Office of Administrative Hearings