BEFORE THE
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE MATTER OF:

PARENTS ON BEHALF OF STUDENT,

v.

IRVINE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT.

OAH CASE NUMBER 2026020950

ORDER FOLLOWING PREHEARING CONFERENCE FOR HEARING BY VIDEOCONFERENCE

APRIL 6, 2026

On April 6, 2026, Administrative Law Judge Tiffany Gilmartin, Office of Administrative Hearings, held a prehearing conference by videoconference. The Administrative Law Judge is called an ALJ. The Office of Administrative Hearings is called OAH. The prehearing conference is called a PHC.

Parent appeared on behalf of Student. Attorney Peter Sansome appeared on behalf of Irvine Unified School District. The PHC was recorded. Based upon discussion with the parties, the ALJ issues the following order:

HEARING DATES, TIMES, AND LOCATION

DUE PROCESS HEARING

The hearing will take place on April 14, 15, and 16, 2026 and continue day to day at the discretion of the ALJ. The hearing shall begin at 9:30 AM each day and generally end at 3:30 PM, unless otherwise ordered.

HEARING LOCATION

OAH is authorized to conduct due process hearings by videoconference or telephone. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 3082, subd. (g).) OAH will conduct the due process hearing by videoconference using the Zoom application. Unless otherwise ordered, participants are required to appear by videoconference using computer or device with video capability and Zoom.

The parties shall immediately notify all potential witnesses of the hearing dates and shall subpoena witnesses, if necessary, to ensure that the witnesses will appear to testify. A party's failure to notify or subpoena a witness to testify will not be considered good cause to continue the hearing. Instructions for issuing and responding to subpoenas and optional forms for subpoenas can be found on the website at https://www.dgs.ca.gov/OAH/Case-Types/Special-Education/Forms/Subpoenas?search=special%20education%20subpoena.

ISSUES AND PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

A FAPE means a free appropriate public education. An IEP means an individualized education program. The ALJ has clarified the statement of issues as allowed by the holdings in *J.W. v. Fresno Unified Sch. Dist.* (9th Cir. 2010) 626 F.3d 431,

442-443, and *Ford v. Long Beach Unified Sch. Dist*. (9th Cir. 2017) 291 F.3d 1086, 1090. (But see *M.C. v. Antelope Valley Union High Sch. Dist.* (9th Cir. 2017) 858 F.3d 1189, 1196, fn. 2 [dictum].) The issues in the complaint have been reorganized and rephrased for clarity. No change in substance has been made. A party believing that an issue has been misstated must file a notice in writing, before the first day of hearing, stating its concern and referring to supporting portions of the complaint. The issues at the due process hearing, and proposed resolutions, as alleged in the complaint and clarified by the parties and the ALJ during the PHC are:

ISSUES

1. Did Irvine deny Student a FAPE during the 2025-2026 school year until February 23, 2026, by:
    a. Failing to implement Student's IEP;
    b. Predetermining transportation services;
    c. Removing transportation supports and services with providing a prior written notice;
    d. Impeding Parental participation by failing to notify Parent following injury to Student?

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

The resolutions requested by Student include compensatory education, transportation services, and any other remedy determined appropriate by the administrative law judge.

Irvine filed its response to Student's complaint on March 5, 2026. (*M.C. v. Antelope Valley Union High School Dist.* (9th Cir. 2017) 858 F.3d 1189, 1199-1200.)

MOTIONS TO EXCLUDE IRVINE'S PROPOSED EXPERT WITNESSES

Student filed a motion on April 5, 2026, seeking to exclude Irvine's proposed expert witnesses identified in Irvine's prehearing conference statement. Student did not seek to prevent the witnesses from testifying but from being designated as experts. The motion was not filed three days before the prehearing conference and was thus untimely. However, Irvine was prepared to respond on the record. Both parties were heard on the record. Student's motion to exclude Irvine's proposed designations of witnesses as expert was denied. Irvine included potential witnesses but has yet to call them or seek expert designation. However, as noted on the record, nothing precludes Student from re-raising this issue during hearing should Irvine seek to designate any of their witnesses as experts.

MOTIONS TO PRODUCE SURVEILLANCE VIDEOS AND MODIFY SUBPOENA DUCES TECUM

Student previously filed two requests for production of documents, one on February 28, 2026, and one on March 2, 2026. Irvine filed a motion to quash improper discovery requests on March 4, 2026. On April 2, 2026, OAH granted Irvine's Motion to Quash Student's Requests for Production of Documents.

On March 19, 2026, Student filed two identical subpoenas requesting January 27, 2026, surveillance video from Meadow Park Elementary School and March 4, 2026, surveillance video from Portola Spring Elementary School. Parent requested the videos be produced directly to her by March 27, 2026.

On March 25, 2026, Irvine filed a motion to modify subpoena. Irvine argued the March 4, 2026, surveillance video is not relevant because it is beyond the date of filing in

Student's instant case. Irvine further argued that Student failed to show a reasonable necessity for the March 4, 2026, video. Irvine argued it was not required to produce the January 27, 2026, video directly to Parent.

Student filed an opposition to Irvine's motion to modify on March 25, 2026. Parent argues the existence of the March 4, 2026, video supports the contention at issue that Irvine denied Parent's rights to participate in her child's education. Parent contends excluding the March 4, 2026, video would preclude Parent from corroborating facts central to proving her case. Parent further argued the videos should be produced on March 27, 2026, to provide her an opportunity to review the footage and prepare for examination and cross-examination of the videos, and consult an independent expert if necessary.

Both parties were heard on the record. Irvine confirmed it complied with the subpoena duces tecum as to the January 27, 2026, video and uploaded it to Case Center. Parent will have access to the video on the first day of the due process hearing.

In general, there is no right to prehearing discovery in due process proceedings under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. (20 U.S.C. § 1400 et seq.) Rather, the IDEA provides parties with the right to present evidence and compel the attendance of witnesses at "a hearing conducted pursuant to subsection (f) or (k)" of section 1415 of title 20 of the United States Code. (20 U.S.C. § 1415(h).) California provides a similar right to present evidence and compel the attendance of witnesses in due process proceedings (Ed. Code, § 56505, subd. (e)), but does not confer the right to prehearing discovery.

Education Code, section 56505, subdivision (a), provides that "[t]he state hearing shall be conducted in accordance with regulations adopted by the board," and under

that authority the Department of Education promulgated section 3082, subdivision (c)(2), of title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, which authorizes the issuance of subpoenas and subpoenas duces tecum. These regulations specifically disallow the provisions of the Administrative Procedures Act that provide broader authority for the use of subpoenas in other administrative hearings. (5 Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 3089, [inapplicability of Govt. Code, §§ 11450.05-11450.30 to due process hearing procedures].)

While subpoenas duces tecum are authorized in special education hearings, their use must be consistent with the legislative and regulatory framework of these proceedings. Pre-hearing discovery in special education cases at the administrative hearing stage is limited. Parents or adult students are entitled to request copies of the educational records, relating to the student in question, that are maintained by the school district. (Ed. Code, § 56504; *Burnett v. San Mateo Foster City School District,* (9th Cir. 2018) 739 Fed. Appx. 870, 873.) The parties are also entitled to disclosures of any evidence an opposing party plans to introduce at hearing 5 business days prior to the date of the first day of hearing. (Ed. Code, 56505(e)(7).)

Student's subpoena directs Irvine to produce the subpoenaed records to surveillance video from January 27, 2026, and March 4, 2026, on March 27, 2026, which is 18 days prior to the first day of hearing. Student has no statutory right to pre-hearing discovery. Section 1987.1 of the Code of Civil Procedure, provides that a court may make an order quashing a subpoena entirely, modifying it, or directing compliance with it. Therefore, the subpoena is modified to change the date of production to April 14, 2026, the first day of hearing.

The March 4, 2026, surveillance video shall be uploaded to Case Center. Nothing precludes Irvine from making an appropriate objection to its admission as evidence if sought at hearing.

EXHIBITS

The parties shall serve their exhibits on each other in compliance with Education Code section 56505, subdivision (e)(7). The parties shall upload their exhibits electronically according to the Order Setting Procedures for Filing Exhibits Electronically. Timely uploading electronic hearing exhibits five business days before the first day of hearing constitutes that party's timely exchange of evidence in compliance with Education Code section 56505, subdivision (e)(7). If further assistance is needed, please contact OAH at OAHSEOps@dgs.ca.gov.

Except for good cause shown, or unless used solely for rebuttal or impeachment, any exhibit not timely exchanged as required by Education Code section 56505, subdivision (e)(7) shall not be admitted into evidence at the hearing unless the ALJ rules that it is admissible.

IDENTIFYING EXHIBITS AND PAGE NUMBERS

Each exhibit must be identified by a letter and number. Student must use the letter S before the number to identify Student's exhibits. Irvine must use the letter D before the number to identify Irvine's exhibits. A cover sheet with this identifying letter and number should be the first page of each exhibit. The electronic evidence program will automatically number the exhibits and additional page numbering or bates stamping should not be added.

CONTENT

Each exhibit must consist of one document. Separate documents may not be combined into one exhibit. Emails or letters may be consolidated into one exhibit if they are part of a single chain of messages. Exhibits should be in chronological order.

Parties should include resumes or curriculum vitae for each witness expected to testify as an expert.

Irvine's exhibits must include a copy of the school calendar for each school year in question.

Electronic copies of exhibits filed with OAH shall be filed by 5:00 PM at least five business days before the first day of hearing. Please refer to the General Order OAH issued with the Scheduling Order that contains the Order Setting Procedures for Filing Exhibits Electronically. It includes instructions for how to file exhibits electronically. Beginning three business days before the hearing, the electronic evidence system will not allow parties to upload exhibits unless permitted by the ALJ during the hearing at the ALJ's discretion.

WITNESSES

The parties shall serve their list of witnesses on each other in compliance with Education Code section 56505. No party shall be permitted to call any witnesses not timely disclosed except for good cause shown, supported by written declaration under penalty of perjury, and at the discretion of the ALJ.

Parties are responsible for ensuring that all participants are familiar with and follow the Instructions for Joining the Online Due Process Hearing provided with this Order. Participants who have not previously used the Zoom application, may find

informative instructions on at by visiting, Getting Started with Zoom at https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/categories/200101697.

The parties are responsible for ensuring that witnesses join the virtual hearing room at the designated date and time to testify. Witnesses are required to join the due process hearing by computer and appear by videoconference unless they do not have the necessary computer equipment. If a witness does not have the necessary equipment, the ALJ may permit the witnesses to appear by audio only or by telephone. "Audio only" means using a computer without video. A witness's inability to attend the hearing by videoconference will be discussed at the start of the hearing.

The parties are responsible for producing their own witnesses unless otherwise ordered by the ALJ. Parties shall make witnesses under their control reasonably available. The parties must schedule their witnesses to avoid delays in the hearing and to minimize or eliminate the need for calling witnesses out of order.

The ALJ has discretion to limit the number of witnesses and the time allowed for testimony. Education Code, section 56505.1, subdivision (h), empowers the ALJ to set a reasonable limit on the length of the hearing after consideration of four factors. The first two factors are the issues to be heard and the complexity of facts to be proven. The second two factors are the ability of the parties or their representatives to present their respective cases and the parties' estimates of the time needed to present their cases.

MEET AND CONFER

The parties are encouraged to review and shorten their witness and exhibit lists before the hearing. Evidence may be excluded if it is repetitive, cumulative, or insufficiently probative to justify the time it would take to hear.

The parties are ordered to meet and confer no later than close of business April 8, 2026, to discuss scheduling witnesses and how much time each witness will take. The parties shall discuss any issues related to counsel and witnesses appearing by videoconference for hearing, electronically viewing exhibits during the hearing, and subpoenas, if any. The parties should attempt to eliminate duplicate exhibits from their hearing exhibits. The parties shall discuss whether they can produce a written stipulation as to pertinent facts, contentions, resolutions and the authenticity and admissibility of documents to shorten the length of time needed for the hearing.

As part of the meet and confer process, Irvine shall inform Student which proposed witnesses are District employees. Irvine shall also identify the witnesses on Student's list that require a subpoena. Irvine may agree to accept service for a witness under Irvine's control or provide Student with the witness's most recent contact information.

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION FORM

Both parties have an ongoing obligation to ensure that OAH has current information on the Participant Information Form filed with OAH and shall file an updated Form as necessary. The Participant Information Form is not served upon the opposing party. The ongoing obligation to ensure that the Participant Information Form filed with OAH is current does not change the parties' statutory obligation to timely disclose their witnesses to the other party(s) at least five business days prior to hearing. The parties must file an updated Participant Information Form to inform OAH of any changes, additions, or deletions, including the required information no later than 5:00 PM at least two business days before the first day of hearing.

Any contact information provided shall be used for the limited purpose of issuing subpoenas or for contacting a witness to attend the hearing. Any contact information shall not be disclosed to any other person.

EVIDENCE PRESENTATION

In an administrative proceeding, the burden of proof is ordinarily on the party requesting the hearing. (*Schaffer v. Weast* (2005) 546 U.S. 49, 62.) In this case Student requested the hearing and bears the burden of proof. Student's case-in-chief shall be presented first, followed by Irvine, unless otherwise ordered.

WITNESS LISTS

The parties must provide a joint proposed witness list to the ALJ on the first day of hearing. The list should include the first and last name of the witness, which party is calling the witness to testify, and include dates and time estimates of each witness's expected testimony. In the event an agreement cannot be reached, each party shall prepare a separate written list. Student must have witnesses available in case there is no agreement.

At the beginning of the hearing, the ALJ and the parties will discuss the length of time anticipated for each witness and scheduling issues for individual witnesses. The ALJ will finalize the witness schedule. Parties must be prepared at the end of each day to discuss the witnesses to be presented the next day and the estimated time for the testimony of each witness.

SCOPE OF WITNESS EXAMINATION

Each witness will be called to testify only once, except for rebuttal purposes. All parties must examine a witness on all issues when the witness is first called to testify. Requiring a witness to appear only once takes priority over the order in which parties present their case-in-chief.

AUDIO ONLY OR TELEPHONIC TESTIMONY

Whether a witness may appear by audio only or telephone instead of videoconference is a matter within the discretion of the ALJ. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 3082, subd. (g).) Any party seeking to present a witness by audio only or telephone shall request permission to do so before the hearing. Any party seeking to present a witness who cannot access exhibits electronically must inform the ALJ at the beginning of the hearing.

ELECTRONIC RECORDINGS

AUDIO RECORDING

A party may request permission to make an audio recording of the hearing. Permission to make an audio recording is subject to the ALJ's discretion and based upon the following conditions:

1. the OAH recording is the only official recording;
2. the parties shall turn their recording device on and off at the same time that the ALJ is on and off the record to avoid recording conversations while off the record;

3. operation of the party's recording mechanism will not be allowed to delay the hearing;
4. a party's recording may not be given, provided or played to a witness, or potential witness;
5. the recording is subject to the same confidentiality as the due process hearing; and
6. participants shall not take screenshots of the videoconference nor share or publish any portion of the videoconference or audio recording.

Neither party has made a request to audio record the hearing. If either party wants to record the hearing, the request must be made before the hearing.

VIDEO RECORDING

No party, witness or anyone else may videorecord any part of the proceedings or stream live through any means.

RECORDINGS AS EXHIBITS

Recordings may not be uploaded electronically without the ALJ's permission. The ALJ has discretion to admit or exclude evidence in the form of a recording. Any request to submit a recording shall be considered at the time of hearing.

The ALJ may grant or deny the request or grant the request subject to certain conditions. The party offering the recording must establish that all or a part of the recording is relevant. The ALJ may request a transcript of the portion of the recording requested or have the party offering the recording to provide an exact identifiable portion of the recording the party seeks to admit. The identities of any person speaking on the portion of the tape being introduced must be established. An ALJ may allow the

opposing party to offer additional portions of a recording to establish the context, or to rebut, the recording.

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION OR REIMBURSEMENT

Any party seeking reimbursement for expenditures shall present admissible evidence of these expenditures, or a stipulation to the amount of the expenditures. A party seeking compensatory education should provide evidence regarding the type, amount, duration, and need for any requested compensatory education. Documents offered as evidence to support a request for reimbursement must be separated by vendor.

MOTIONS

No other prehearing motions are pending or contemplated. Any motion that was not filed three business days before the PHC, shall be supported by a declaration under penalty of perjury establishing good cause why the motion was not timely filed.

STIPULATIONS

Stipulations to pertinent facts, contentions, resolutions and authenticity and admissibility of documents are encouraged. Any proposed stipulation shall be submitted to the assigned ALJ in writing prior to the start of the hearing.

CONDUCT OF PARTICIPANTS AND HEARING ROOM DECORUM

All participants to the videoconference should observe the same decorum as in an in-person due process hearing. Participants must conduct themselves in a professional and courteous manner at all times. Cellular phones, telephones and computer notifications must be shut off or set to silent during the hearing unless the

ALJ grants permission otherwise. Participants should appear from a private location, unless otherwise ordered. Participants should take reasonable efforts to minimize background noise and maintain adequate room lighting. Use of virtual background images are at the discretion of the ALJ. Witnesses are prohibited from reading exhibits, documents, notes, text messages, telephones or computers while testifying, unless permitted to do so by the ALJ. The parties, their representative and witnesses are prohibited from passing notes to, exchanging electronic messages with, or signaling the witness in any way while the witness is testifying.

LANGUAGE INTERPRETERS AND REASONABLE ACCOMMODATIONS

A Russian language interpreter is needed. OAH will provide the interpreter.

A party or participant in this case, such as a witness, requiring reasonable accommodation to participate in a mediation or hearing may contact OAH at (916) 263-0880, or send an email to OAHADA@dgs.ca.gov as soon as the need is known. The e-mail should have "Request for Accommodation" in the Subject Line. Additional information concerning requests for reasonable accommodation is available on OAH's website at: https://www.dgs.ca.gov/OAH/Services/Page-Content/Office-of-Administrative-Hearings-Services-List-Folder/Request-Reasonable-Accommodations-for-OAH-Legal-Proceedings.

HEARING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

During the prehearing conference, Parent requested an open hearing. The request was granted. On April 7, 2026, Parent filed a Request for Public and Media Access Information. The information included here is responsive to that request.

The hearing is open to the public. Special education hearings are closed to the public unless a student requests the hearing to be open to the public.

The Student has requested an open hearing. Either party may forward this invitation to observers. Generally, observers do not need to identify themselves but must have respectful usernames when joining the hearing. Should an observer be a member of the media, they are welcome to attend; however, they must identify themselves. Observers will be admitted at the beginning of each day of hearing, as well as after the lunch break. The ALJ may admit observers at other times pursuant to the ALJ's discretion. Any prospective witness may not observe the hearing until their testimony is completed and with the ALJ's permission.

By choosing an open hearing, Student is on notice that highly sensitive personal information will be seen and heard by observers.

The following Order applies to observers:

1. Microphone and video shall be off at all times, unless otherwise ordered;
2. Hearing observers will not be allowed to record, photograph, or broadcast the hearing. (California Rules of Court, rule 1.150.);
3. The ALJ may exclude persons whose actions impede the orderly conduct of the hearing or take other action to promote due process or the orderly conduct of the hearing. (Cal. Code Regs., Tit. 1, § 1030, subd. (e).) Further, the ALJ may order an open hearing to be closed or make other protective orders to the extent necessary or proper to ensure a fair hearing in the circumstances of the case, including to protect a minor witness or a witness with a developmental disability. (Gov. Code § 11425.20, subd. (a).)

FAILURE TO FOLLOW THESE ORDERS MAY RESULT IN SANCTIONS AS ALLOWED BY LAW

SETTLEMENT

The parties are encouraged to continue working together to reach an agreement before the due process hearing. The parties shall inform OAH in writing immediately if they reach a settlement or otherwise resolve the dispute before the scheduled hearing. In addition, if a settlement is reached within five days of the scheduled start of the due process hearing, the parties shall also inform OAH of the settlement by telephone at (916) 263-0880. At the same time, the parties should send the signature page of the signed agreement or a letter withdrawing the case to OAH by visiting OAH Secure e-file at https://www.applications.dgs.ca.gov/oah/oahsftweb.

If a full and final written settlement agreement is reached after 4:00 PM the day prior to hearing, the parties shall leave a voicemail message regarding the settlement at (916) 274-6035. The parties should also leave contact information such as cellular phone numbers of each party or counsel for each party.

Dates for hearing will not be cancelled until the letter of withdrawal or signature page of the signed agreement has been received and processed by OAH. If an agreement in principle is reached, the parties should plan to attend the scheduled hearing unless different arrangements have been agreed upon by the assigned ALJ. The assigned ALJ will check for messages before the hearing.

If the matter settles subject to board approval, in addition to a signed copy of the signature page of the settlement agreement, the parties shall provide the date of the next board meeting. The hearing dates will not be cancelled without this information.

FAILURE TO COMPLY

The failure to comply with this Order may result in the exclusion of evidence or other sanctions.

ORDER INCLUDES ALL RULINGS

This Order includes all rulings made at the prehearing conference. Any discussion and conversation not referenced in this Order is not binding on the ALJ conducting the hearing and may not be relied upon by the parties. The parties should be aware that, at hearing, the ALJ conducting the hearing has discretion to reconsider any part of this Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Tiffany Gilmartin

Tiffany Gilmartin
Administrative Law Judge
Office of Administrative Hearings