BEFORE THE
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of:	
PARENT ON BEHALF OF STUDENT,	OAH Case No. 2017101105
v.	ORDER DETERMINING SUFFICIENCY OF DUE PROCESS COMPLAINT
RAMONA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT.	

On October 26, 2017, Student filed a Due Process Hearing Request with the Office of Administrative Hearings, naming Ramona Unified School District. On November 9, 2017, District timely filed a Notice of Insufficiency 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. (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

The facts alleged in Student's complaint are sufficient to put District on notice of the issues forming the basis of the complaint. The complaint identifies one issue that alleges District denied Student a FAPE during the 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 school years. There are six sub-issues that include: (1) failure to develop an IEP that enabled Student to obtain educational benefit; (2) failure to implement Student's IEP; (3) failure to provide Student with an appropriate placement; (4) amending Student's IEP without parental consent; (5) interfering with Parent's opportunity to meaningfully participate; and (6) failure to timely and appropriate assess Student in all areas of suspected disability. The complaint includes sufficient facts related to the issue and sub-issues to permit District to prepare for a due process hearing and participate in a resolution session and mediation. The complaint also contains adequate proposed resolutions.

Therefore, Student'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 shall remain as scheduled.

DATE: November 13, 2017

DocuSigned by:
Tara Doss
0D223C0D8032412...

TARA DOSS
Administrative Law Judge
Office of Administrative Hearings