BEFORE THE
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

| | |
|---|---|
| In the Matter of:<br><br>VICTOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT,<br><br>v.<br><br>PARENT ON BEHALF OF STUDENT. | OAH Case No. 2016070164<br><br>ORDER DETERMINING SUFFICIENCY OF DUE PROCESS COMPLAINT |

On July 5, 2016, Victor Elementary School District filed a due process hearing complaint naming Parent on Student's behalf. On July 15, 2015, Student filed a notice of insufficiency regarding Victor's complaint.

## APPLICABLE LAW

The named parties to a due process hearing request have the right to challenge the sufficiency of the complaint. (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 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 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. (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

Victor's complaint seeks a determination that its, "psycho-educational assessment and behavioral assessment of 2016 were legally sufficient…" Student asserts that the facts supporting this issue should render the complaint insufficient because more than one behavior assessment was completed in 2016 and the facts section does not differentiate between the two assessments. The facts alleged in Victor's complaint are sufficient to put Student on notice of the issues forming the basis of the complaint. Victor's complaint identifies the issues and adequate related facts about the problem to permit Student to respond to the complaint and participate in mediation. Therefore, Victor's complaint 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: July 18, 2016

DocuSigned by:
Joy Redmon
5155E4ECA68C4B1...

JOY REDMON
Administrative Law Judge
Office of Administrative Hearings