BEFORE THE
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of: PARENT ON BEHALF OF STUDENT, v. SAN JUAN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT.	OAH CASE NO. 2013031072 ORDER OF DETERMINATION OF SUFFICIENCY OF DUE PROCESS COMPLAINT

On March 25, 2013 Student's parent on behalf of Student (Student) filed a Due Process Hearing Request[1] (complaint) naming the San Juan Unified School District (District).

On April 2, 2013, the District 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

[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).

named parties with sufficient information to know how to prepare for the hearing and how to participate in resolution sessions and mediation.[4]

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

Student alleges that the District failed to inform Student's parents about reimbursement for transportation costs during the time Student attended school in the District. However, the complaint does not specify what years are at issue in the complaint. Student's complaint indicates that the family currently resides within a different school district. The District in the instant case needs know which year or years are at issue prior to responding to the complaint.

The dates at issue are particularly important in this case, because there may be a statute of limitations problem -- Student alleges that an exception to the statute of limitations applies under the federal regulations. (34 C.F.R. § 300.511(f)(2) (2006).) However, without a complaint that specifies the time periods at issue, it is not possible for the District to evaluate the merits of such an exception and know how to respond at mediation, in a resolution session and at hearing.

On the same day that the District filed its NOI, it also filed a request to dismiss Student's case based on the statute of limitations. However, there is no need to rule on the

---

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

[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).

motion at this time – because Student has not yet filed a sufficient complaint, the motion to dismiss is premature.

ORDER

1. Student's complaint is insufficiently pled under section Title 20 United States Code section 1415(c)(2)(D).

2. Student shall be permitted to file an amended complaint under Title 20 United States Code section 1415(c)(2)(E)(i)(II).[8]

3. The amended complaint shall comply with the requirements of Title 20 United States Code section 1415(b)(7)(A)(ii), and shall be filed not later than 14 days from the date of this order.

4. If Student fails to file a timely amended complaint, the complaint will be dismissed.

5. All dates previously set in this matter are vacated.

6. The District's motion to dismiss filed on April 2, 2013, is moot.

Dated: April 3, 2013

/s/
SUSAN RUFF
Administrative Law Judge
Office of Administrative Hearings

[8] The filing of an amended complaint will restart the applicable timelines for a due process hearing.