BEFORE THE
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE MATTER OF:

NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,

v.

PARENTS ON BEHALF OF STUDENT.

OAH CASE NUMBER 2025040959

ORDER DENYING NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT'S MOTION FOR VIDEOCONFERENCE TESTIMONY

SEPTEMBER 18, 2025

On September 17, 2025, Natomas Unified School District filed a Motion to Permit Witness to Testify Via Videoconference, with the Office of Administrative Hearings. Typically, OAH permits three days for the other party to respond to a motion. Given the nature of the request and that the hearing is next week, OAH elected to issue this ruling without a response.

Natomas requested one witness, a former district employee, to testify via videoconference. The witness resides outside of its boundaries and faces significant childcare responsibilities, including daily daycare obligations for his young child. These

factors make it unduly burdensome for him to travel to attend the hearing in person. Accordingly, Natomas requests he be permitted to testify via videoconference.

Natomas filed its request for due process on April 21, 2025. It seeks a determination that Student's multidisciplinary triennial reevaluation is legally compliant such that Student is not entitled to an independent educational evaluation at public expense. Parent, the named respondent and Student's sole representative, made a request for an in-person hearing. The request was made under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq.) OAH's ADA coordinator conducted an interactive interview with Parent and granted the request as a reasonable accommodation. Based on the confidential nature of the request, the determination but not underlying basis for the request, was discussed with the parties during the prehearing conference on September 12, 2025.

OAH is authorized to conduct due process hearings by videoconference or telephone. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 3082, subd. (g).) As noted in the Motion, OAH routinely conducts hearings via videoconference. Further, Natomas pointed out that OAH permitted telephonic testimony in limited circumstance for in person hearings. However, in this case the hearing is conducted in person as a reasonable accommodation requiring all parties and witnesses to appear in person. The burden this

witness faces in appearing in person is subordinate to need for the reasonable accommodation. Accordingly, Natomas' motion is DENIED. All parties and witnesses must appear in person for this hearing.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Joy Redmon

Joy Redmon
Presiding Administrative Law Judge
Office of Administrative Hearings