BEFORE THE
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of: PARENT ON BEHALF OF STUDENT, v. TORRANCE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT.	OAH CASE NO. 2014010508 ORDER OF DETERMINATION OF SUFFICIENCY OF DUE PROCESS COMPLAINT

On January 13, 2014, Student filed a Due Process Hearing Request[1] (complaint) naming Torrance Unified School District (District). On January 28, 2014, District timely filed a Notice of Insufficiency (NOI) as to Student's complaint.

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).

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.[3] 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.[4]

---

[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(b)(7)(A)(ii)(III) & (IV).

[4] 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."[5] 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.[6] Whether the complaint is sufficient is a matter within the sound discretion of the Administrative Law Judge.[7]

DISCUSSION

The complaint alleges that District denied Student a FAPE by failing to find Student eligible for special education and related services, failing to provide an appropriate placement and program where Student could make meaningful progress, and failing to conduct an appropriate psycho-educational evaluation.

The facts alleged in the complaint are sufficient to put the District on notice of the issues stated above, and provided adequate related facts about the problem to permit District to respond to the complaint, participate in a resolution session and mediation. As remedies, Student wants District funded independent evaluations, and an IEP team meeting to be convened to find Student eligible for special education services and the development of an appropriate individualized education program, reimbursements to parents for privately funded educational services, and compensatory intensive educational therapy.

District's arguments that Student needs to specify when District should have identified Student eligible for special education, specify the type of specialized academic and designated instruction and services Student should be provided, and to specify why auditory or visual processing are suspected areas of assessment, beyond that which was alleged in the complaint, are not proper basis for the NOI. Student is not required to allege each issue with the level of specificity demanded by District when Student has satisfied the minimal notice

---

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

[6] *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.].

[7] 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).

requirements demanded by the IDEA. Student properly alleged her issues and requested specific remedies.

ORDER

1. The complaint is deemed sufficient under Title 20 United States Code section 1415(c)(2)(C) and Education Code section 56502, subdivision (d)(1).

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

Dated: January 30, 2014

/s/

SABRINA KONG
Administrative Law Judge
Office of Administrative Hearings