BEFORE THE
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE MATTER OF:

PARENTS ON BEHALF OF STUDENT,

v.

VACAVILLE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT.

OAH CASE NUMBER 2026020379

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR STAY PUT

APRIL 14, 2026

On March 23, 2026, Student filed a motion for stay put. This motion was 93 pages long and included reference to another student. This motion included numerous medical records, emails, and what appears to be various pages of incomplete IEP documents.

Vacaville filed a response on March 25, 2026. Vacaville's response included a copy of the January 28, 2025, IEP document and a declaration from counsel that this is the last agreed-upon and implemented IEP.

On March 25, 2026, Student filed three documents. Student filed a reply to Vacaville's opposition. Student filed a Notice of Errata, correcting the error of the

original motion that identified a different student. Student further filed a declaration from Parent that included screenshots and medical records.

Finally, on April 1, 2026, Student filed a supplementary declaration of Parent.

Student did not identify a specific IEP or amendment that constituted stay put. Despite this it appears from the voluminous filings that he is arguing his stay put placement includes some version of home placement.

APPLICABLE LAW

Until due process hearing procedures are complete, a special education student is entitled to remain in his or her current educational placement, unless the parties agree otherwise. (20 U.S.C. § 1415(j); 34 C.F.R. § 300.518(a) (2006); Ed.Code, § 56505 subd. (d).) This is referred to as "stay put." For purposes of stay put, the current educational placement is typically the last agreed upon and implemented individualized educational program, called IEP, placement prior to the dispute arising. (*Thomas v. Cincinnati Bd. of Educ.* (6th Cir. 1990) 918 F.2d 618, 625.)

DISCUSSION

Student's motions appear to contend he is entitled to a home placement as a function of stay put. Student failed to submit a consented to IEP document that

supports his contention. Student failed to demonstrate which services and placement are at issue. Thus, Student's motion for stay put as to a home placement is denied.

ORDER

Student's motion for stay put is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Tiffany Gilmartin

Tiffany Gilmartin

Administrative Law Judge

Office of Administrative Hearings