BEFORE THE
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE MATTER OF:

PARENTS ON BEHALF OF STUDENT,

v.

TAHOE TRUCKEE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT AND

SIERRA EXPEDITIONARY LEARNING SCHOOL.

OAH CASE NUMBER 2026050505

ORDER DENYING STUDENT'S EMERGENCY MOTION TO ENFORCE STANDING NO-CONTACT ORDER AND CEASE AND DESIST FOR LACK OF JURISDICTION

JUNE 23, 2026

On May 19, 2026, Parent on behalf of Student filed a motion titled Emergency Motion To Enforce Standing No-Contact Order And Cease and Desist. The Respondents, Tahoe-Truckee Unified School District and Sierra Expeditionary Learning School, did not file a response to this motion.

Here, Parent requests that OAH enforce an alleged standing no-contact protocol and cease and desist directives previously served upon Tahoe-Truckee Unified School

District and Sierra Expeditionary Learning School, by Parent in April and May 2026. Parent did not attach the no-contact protocols and cease and desist directives to the motion, and thus, are unknown to OAH. As discussed below, OAH lacks jurisdiction over these orders so the outcome would have been the same even if attached.

Parent complains that the no-contact protocols and cease and desist directives were violated through a communication exchanged by email; participation in a Student Attendance Review Team, called SART, process; and actions related to Student's attendance status. Parent requests that OAH quash the SART process, compel compliance with correspondence restrictions, and make findings of bad faith. Parent additionally asserts that the challenged conduct violates Student's stay-put rights.

OAH's jurisdiction is limited to matters arising under the Individuals with Disabilities Act, called IDEA, its implementing regulations, and applicable provisions of the California Education Code governing special education. OAH's authority does not extend to the general enforcement of private no-contact directives, cease and desist demands, correspondence protocols, attendance review procedures, or other matters that are not shown to arise under the IDEA or California special education law.

Based upon the allegations presented in the motion, Parent failed to demonstrate how these issues fall within OAH's statutory jurisdiction. Nor had Parent established that the challenged communications and conduct constitute a special education dispute over which OAH may grant relief.

To the extent that Student's alleged a violation of stay-put-rights, the motion failed to establish a sufficient nexus between the complained of conduct and Student's educational placement, special education services, or any other rights protected by stay-put provisions of the IDEA. Alleged violations of a no-contact protocol, attendance

status determinations, participation in SART proceedings, or isolated email communications, not attached to this motion, do not, as presented in this motion, constitute a change in placement or otherwise implicate stay-put protections.

Accordingly, because the motion as presented and relief requested fall outside of OAH's jurisdiction, and the motion fails to demonstrate a cognizable claim arising under the IDEA or applicable California special education law, Parent's motion on behalf of Student is denied for lack of jurisdiction.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Cynthia Fritz

Cynthia Fritz
Administrative Law Judge
Office of Administrative Hearings