BEFORE THE
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of: PARENT ON BEHALF OF STUDENT, v. MONROVIA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT.	OAH Case No. 2018050081 ORDER DENYING DISTRICT'S NOTICE OF INSUFFICIENCY

On May 2, 2018, Student filed a Due Process Hearing Request with the Office of Administrative Hearings naming Monrovia Unified School District. On May 16, 2018, District filed a notice of insufficiency as to Student's case. District contends that Student failed to set forth the specific individualized education program and how the present levels of performance and goals were misaligned with Student's needs. Student did not file an opposition.

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

Student's case involves whether District denied Student a free appropriate public education for the 2017-2018 school year, and specifically if the reading program met Student's needs. Student set forth the school year in question, facts detailing why District's FAPE offer was inappropriate, and proposed resolutions. The facts alleged in Student's complaint were sufficient to put District on notice of the issues and for District to respond to the complaint, and participate in resolution, mediation, and hearing. Therefore, District's notice of insufficiency is denied.

ORDER

1. The complaint is deemed sufficient under title 20 United States Code section 1415(c)(2)(C) and Education Code section 56502, subdivision (d)(1).

2. All mediation, prehearing conference, and hearing dates in this matter are confirmed.

DATE: May 29, 2018

DocuSigned by:
Sabrina Kong
6159FBB6742E44F...

SABRINA KONG
Administrative Law Judge
Office of Administrative Hearings