BEFORE THE
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of: PARENT ON BEHALF OF STUDENT, v. LONG BEACH UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT.	OAH CASE NO. 2014110532 ORDER OF DETERMINATION OF SUFFICIENCY OF DUE PROCESS COMPLAINT

On November 7, 2014, Student filed a Due Process Hearing Request[1] (complaint) naming Long Beach Unified School District. The complaint was mailed to OAH through the United States Postal Service, postmarked November 4, 2014, and received by OAH on November 7, 2014. The complaint was a letter written in Spanish, and did not contain a proof of service upon District.

On November 26, 2014, District filed a Notice of Insufficiency as to Student's complaint. In its NOI, District asserts it received Student's complaint on November 18, 2014.

APPLICABLE LAW

The named parties to a due process hearing request have the right to challenge the sufficiency of the complaint.[2] 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 the Office of Administrative Hearings 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.[3]

---

[1] A request for a due process hearing under Education Code section 56502 is the due process complaint notice required under Title 20 United States Code section 1415(b)(7)(A).

[2] 20 U.S.C. § 1415(b) & (c).

[3] 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, evaluation, or educational placement of the child, or the provision of a free appropriate public education (FAPE) 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.[4] 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.[5]

The complaint provides enough information when it provides "an awareness and understanding of the issues forming the basis of the complaint."[6] 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.[7] Whether the complaint is sufficient is a matter within the sound discretion of the Administrative Law Judge.[8]

DISCUSSION

Student's complaint was filed on November 7, 2014. District indicates in its NOI that it received Student's complaint on November 18, 2014. District's NOI was dated, filed with OAH, and served on November 26, 2014, which is more than 15 days after OAH received Student's complaint; but it is not more than 15 days after District asserts it received the complaint. Student did not provide a declaration that the complaint had been served upon District and there is no evidence to contradict District's assertion that it received Student's complaint on November 18, 2014. District's NOI is therefore deemed timely and the legal sufficiency of the complaint is analyzed below.

---

[4] 20 U.S.C. § 1415(b)(7)(A)(ii)(III) & (IV).

[5] See, H.R.Rep. No. 108-77, 1st Sess. (2003), p. 115; Sen. Rep. No. 108-185, 1st Sess. (2003), pp. 34-35.

[6] Sen. Rep. No. 108-185, *supra*, at p. 34.

[7] *Alexandra R. v. Brookline School Dist*. (D.N.H., Sept. 10, 2009, No. 06-cv-0215-JL) 2009 WL 2957991 at p.3 [nonpub. opn.]; *Escambia County Board 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, No. 8:04CV2657T24EAJ) 2005 WL 2850076 at p. 3[nonpub. opn.] ; but cf. *M.S.-G. v. Lenape Regional High School Dist.* (3d Cir. 2009) 306 Fed.Appx. 772, at p. 3[nonpub. opn.].

[8] Assistance to States for the Education of Children With Disabilities and Preschool Grants for Children With Disabilities, 71 Fed.Reg. 46540-46541, 46699 (Aug. 14, 2006).

Student alleges that under his prior individualized education program (IEP), dated November 14, 2013, and attached to the complaint, Student received five hours of behavior management services each week. Student alleges that District threatened to and had in fact reduced Student's behavior management services to one hour each month, supervision only. Student requests that his prior level of behavior management services be reinstated. The facts alleged in Student's complaint are sufficient to put District on notice of the issues forming the basis of the complaint. Student's complaint identifies the issues and adequate related facts about the problem to permit District to respond to the complaint and participate in a resolution session and mediation.

Therefore, Student's statement of the claim is sufficient.

ORDER

1. The complaint is sufficient under Title 20 United States Code section 1415(b)(7)(A)(ii).

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

DATE: December 3, 2014

/s/

KARA HATFIELD
Administrative Law Judge
Office of Administrative Hearings