

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 STUDENT'S REQUEST FOR
RECONSIDERATION

AUGUST 10, 2026

On August 6, 2010, the undersigned Presiding Administrative Law Judge from the Office of Administrative Hearings, called OAH, issued an Order Denying Peremptory Challenge. On August 7, 2026, Student filed a motion for reconsideration. Given the close proximity of the hearing start date on August 11, 2026, OAH did not wait its customary three business days to allow the responding party to reply. Vacaville Unified School District had not filed a response when this Order was issued.

OAH will generally reconsider a ruling upon a showing of new or different facts, circumstances, or law justifying reconsideration, when the party seeks reconsideration within a reasonable period of time, generally within 10 days. (See, e.g., Gov. Code,

§ 11521; Code Civ. Proc., § 1008.) The party seeking reconsideration may also be required to provide an explanation for its failure to previously provide the different facts, circumstances or law. (See *Baldwin v. Home Savings of America* (1997) 59 Cal.App.4th 1192, 1199-1200.)

Student argues that its peremptory challenge against ALJ Paul Kamoroff was not untimely and should have been granted because, even though ALJ Kamoroff convened two prehearing conferences with the parties, he was not technically “assigned” to the case because “OAH routinely removes the assigned ALJs from the hearing.” Further, Student argues that “Because of OAH’s practice of assigning ALJs to hear a matter – but not doing so permanently and replacing ALJs who have been ‘assigned’ to hear a complaint following their assignment, the motion by Petitioner was timely and should be granted.”

Student’s arguments are not persuasive to warrant reconsideration or granting the peremptory challenge against ALJ Kamoroff. Student’s arguments take issue with how OAH assigns ALJs to cases but fail to overcome Student’s noncompliance with the law on filing a timely peremptory challenge. Further, Student did not offer any new or different facts, circumstances, or law justifying reconsideration. Therefore, the motion for reconsideration is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Tara Doss

Tara Doss

Presiding Administrative Law Judge

Office of Administrative Hearings