BEFORE THE
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE MATTER OF:

PARENTS ON BEHALF OF STUDENT,

v.

SAN RAMON VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT.

OAH CASE NUMBER 2025120043

# ORDER DETERMINING DUE PROCESS COMPLAINT SUFFICIENT

DECEMBER 19, 2025

On December 1, 2025, Student filed a Due Process Hearing Request, called a complaint, with the Office of Administrative Hearings, referred to as OAH, naming San Ramon Valley Unified School District. On December 16, 2025, San Ramon 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).

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

Student's complaint contains seven issues. San Ramon asserts all of Student's issues, with the exception of Issue Two, are vague and therefore insufficient. San Ramon contends Student's complaint fails to provide "sufficient notice of the issues and dates." San Ramon's assertions are unpersuasive. Student's complaint contains dates in connection with each issue. In addition, Student's complaint includes facts regarding individualized education programs, called IEPs, and school years in connection with the issues. Further, San Ramon's claim that Student's Issue Three is insufficient because it is outside OAH's jurisdiction, is rejected, as lack of jurisdiction does not render a complaint insufficient.

The facts alleged in Student's complaint are sufficient. Student's complaint contains sufficient information to allow San Ramon to respond to the complaint and prepare for resolution sessions, mediation, and hearing.

## 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.

*Daniel Senter*

Daniel Senter
Administrative Law Judge
Office of Administrative Hearings