BEFORE THE
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE MATTER OF:

PARENTS ON BEHALF OF STUDENT,

v.

FOLSOM-CORDOVA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT.

OAH CASE NUMBER 2026060988

# ORDER DETERMINING DUE PROCESS COMPLAINT SUFFICIENT

JUNE 29, 2026

On June 17, 2026, Student filed a Due Process Hearing Request, called a complaint, with the Office of Administrative Hearings, referred to as OAH, naming Folsom-Cordova. On June 24, 2026, Folsom-Cordova filed a Notice of Insufficiency as to the complaint.

## APPLICABLE LAW

The named parties have the right to challenge the complaint's sufficiency. (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: (1) describes the problem relating to the proposed change regarding the Student's identification, evaluation, or educational placement, or providing the Student a free appropriate public education; (2) includes facts about the problem; and (3) includes a proposed resolution 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

The issues and facts alleged in Student's complaint are sufficient. The complaint identifies the issues and adequate facts about the problem to permit Folsom-Cordova to respond and participate in a resolution session and mediation.

Student's complaint alleges four claims. Folsom-Cordova alleges the issues are insufficiently pled, in part, because they do not include IEP team meeting dates and are not specific as to the time period alleged. Folsom-Cordova also asserts that the facts contain information that predates the statute of limitations, thus rendering the complaint vague. These arguments are unpersuasive. First, nothing in Student's complaint asserts Student is intending to extend the two-year statute of limitations. Second, the IDEA's liberal pleading standards do not require a complaint to include IEP team meeting dates to overcome an insufficiency claim. Finally, any additional clarification regarding specific meeting or document request dates can be addressed at the prehearing conference.

Student's complaint is sufficiently pled.

ORDER

1. The complaint is sufficient under title 20 United States Code section 1415(b)(7)(A)(ii).
2. All prehearing conference and hearing dates in this matter are confirmed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Joy Redmon

Joy Redmon

Presiding Administrative Law Judge

Office of Administrative Hearings