BEFORE THE
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE MATTER OF:

PARENTS ON BEHALF OF STUDENT,

v.

SIMI VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT.

OAH CASE NUMBER 2025120515

ORDER FOLLOWING PREHEARING CONFERENCE FOR HEARING BY VIDEOCONFERENCE, DENYING MOTION TO DISMISS, AND DENYING MOTION IN LIMINE WITHOUT PREJUDICE

FEBRUARY 10, 2026

On February 6, 2026, Administrative Law Judge Ashok Pathi, Office of Administrative Hearings, held a prehearing conference by videoconference. The Administrative Law Judge is called an ALJ. The Office of Administrative Hearings is called OAH. The prehearing conference is called a PHC.

Parent, who is a California licensed attorney appeared on behalf of Student. Attorneys Dee Anna Hassanpour and Lucy Nadzharyan appeared on behalf of Simi

Valley Unified School District. The PHC was recorded. Based upon discussion with the parties, the ALJ issues the following order:

HEARING DATES, TIMES, AND LOCATION

DUE PROCESS HEARING

The hearing will take place on February 18, and 19, 2026, and continue day to day at the discretion of the ALJ. The hearing shall begin at 9:30 AM each day and generally end at 3:30 PM, unless otherwise ordered. The parties anticipate it will take eight days to complete the hearing. Additional hearing dates will be discussed with the ALJ during the hearing.

HEARING LOCATION

OAH is authorized to conduct due process hearings by videoconference or telephone. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 3082, subd. (g).) OAH will conduct the due process hearing by videoconference using the Zoom application. Unless otherwise ordered, participants are required to appear by videoconference using computer or device with video capability and Zoom.

The parties shall immediately notify all potential witnesses of the hearing dates and shall subpoena witnesses, if necessary, to ensure that the witnesses will appear to testify. A party's failure to notify or subpoena a witness to testify will not be considered good cause to continue the hearing. Instructions for issuing and responding to subpoenas and optional forms for subpoenas can be found on the website at https://www.dgs.ca.gov/OAH/Case-Types/Special-Education/Forms/Subpoenas?search=special%20education%20subpoena.

SIMI VALLEY'S MOTION TO DISMISS

On February 3, 2026, Simi Valley filed a motion to dismiss in part, arguing that several of Student's issues fall outside of OAH's limited jurisdiction or were duplicative of other issues Student pled. Simi Valley's motion specifically targets Student's issues 1(i), 1(v), 2(i), 2(vii), 4(a), 4(b), 4(d), 4(e), 7(iii), 8, and 9.

On February 5, 2026, Student filed a response. Student did not oppose dismissal of issues 2(vii) and 9, but otherwise opposed Simi Valley's motion. Student argued that Student's claims were within OAH's limited jurisdiction and that Simi Valley's motion improperly sought determination on the merits of Student's issues prior to a due process hearing.

The purpose of the IDEA is to ensure that all children with disabilities have available to them a FAPE, and to protect the rights of those children and their parents. (20 U.S.C. § 1400(d)(1)(A), (B), and (C); see also Ed. Code, § 56000.) A party has the right to present a complaint "with respect to any matter relating to the identification, evaluation, or educational placement of the child, or the provision of a [FAPE] to such child." (20 U.S.C. § 1415(b)(6); Ed. Code, § 56501, subd. (a) [party has a right to present a complaint regarding matters involving a proposal or refusal to initiate or change the identification, assessment, or educational placement of a child; the provision of a FAPE to a child; the refusal of a parent or guardian to consent to an assessment of a child; or a disagreement between a parent or guardian and the public education agency as to the availability of a program appropriate for a child, including the question of financial responsibility].) The jurisdiction of OAH is limited to these matters. (*Wyner v. Manhattan Beach Unified Sch. Dist.* (9th Cir. 2000) 223 F.3d 1026, 1028-1029 (*Wyner*).)

OAH's limited jurisdiction does not include claims alleging a school district's failure to comply with a settlement agreement. (*Wyner, supra*, 223 F.3d at p. 1030.) In *Wyner*, the parties reached a settlement agreement in which the district agreed to provide certain services during the course of a due process hearing. The hearing officer ordered the parties to abide by the terms of the agreement.

Two years later, the student filed another due process hearing alleging the district did not comply with the settlement agreement in the first case. A hearing officer determined that the issues alleging the failure to comply with the settlement agreement in the first case were beyond its jurisdiction. This ruling was upheld on appeal.

The decision in *Wyner* held that "the proper avenue to enforce Special Education Hearing Office orders" was the California Department of Education's compliance complaint procedure (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 4600, et. seq.), and that "a subsequent due process hearing was not available to address . . . alleged noncompliance with the settlement agreement and Special Education Hearing Office order in a prior due process hearing." (*Wyner, supra*, 223 F.3d at p. 1030.)

In *Pedraza v. Alameda Unified Sch. Dist*. (N.D. Cal. 2007, No. C 05-04977 VRW) 2007 WL 949603, the District Court held that OAH has jurisdiction to adjudicate claims that allege a student was denied a free appropriate public education as a result of the violation of a mediated settlement agreement, where the parties agreed that the services provided through the settlement agreement represented a free appropriate public education for the student. However, a breach of a mediated settlement agreement should be addressed by the California Department of Education's compliance complaint procedure.

OAH also does not have jurisdiction to determine claims under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. § 701 et seq.), Section 1983 of Title 42 United States Code, the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. §§ 12101, et seq.), the Unruh Civil Rights Act (Civ. Code, § 51), and other state and federal civil rights laws, including tort claims of retaliation and discrimination, or determination if certain conduct was retaliatory or discriminatory.

The ALJ discussed Simi Valley's motion to dismiss during the PHC. Student did not object to dismissing Issues 2(vii) and 9. Those issues are dismissed as withdrawn.

Simi Valley's motion related to Issues 1(i), 1(v), 2(i), 4(a), 4(b), 4(d), 4(e), 7(iii), and 8 is denied. Special education due process proceedings do not include summary judgment motions. Simi Valley's arguments for dismissal represent defenses Simi Valley may raise at hearing, and it is improper to evaluate arguments on the merits of Student's issues before the hearing.

ISSUES AND PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

During the PHC, the parties and the ALJ engaged in significant discussion regarding Student's issues. During this discussion, Student withdrew certain issues and combined others.

The ALJ has clarified and reorganized the statement of some issues as allowed by the holdings in *J.W. v. Fresno Unified Sch. Dist*. (9th Cir. 2010) 626 F.3d 431, 442-443, and *Ford v. Long Beach Unified Sch. Dist.* (9th Cir. 2002) 291 F.3d 1086, 1090. (But see *M.C. v. Antelope Valley Union High Sch. Dist*. (9th Cir. 2017) 858 F.3d 1189, 1196, fn. 2 [dictum].) No change in substance has been made. A party believing that an issue has been misstated or improperly omitted shall promptly file a notice in writing, prior to the

first day of hearing, stating its concern and referring to supporting portions of the complaint.

A free appropriate public education is called a FAPE. An individualized education program is called an IEP.

The issues at the due process hearing, and proposed resolutions, as alleged in the complaint and clarified by the parties and the ALJ during the PHC are:

ISSUES

1. Did Simi Valley deny Student a FAPE by failing to timely convene an IEP team meeting pursuant to Parents' June 2, 2025, request?
2. Did Simi Valley deny Student a FAPE by failing to reconvene Student's IEP team meeting, when necessary, from the beginning of the 2025-2026 school year through December 11, 2025?
3. Did Simi Valley deny Student a FAPE by conducting a special education assessment of Student on September 10, 2025, without parental consent?
4. Did Simi Valley deny Student a FAPE in the September 11, 2025, IEP by:
    A. improperly adding an IEP team meeting participant without adequate notice?
    B. improperly terminating the IEP team meeting early?
    C. predetermining its decision to not implement the January 23, 2025, IEP?
    D. improperly seeking Parents' consent to the September 11, 2025, IEP?
5. Did Simi Valley deny Student a FAPE in the October and November 2025, annual IEP, by:
    A. including participants from Simi Valley who had a disqualifying conflict of interest?

B. predetermining its decision to not implement the January 23, 2025, IEP?

C. failing to offer appropriate goals?

D. failing to offer appropriate specialized academic instruction services?

E. failing to offer appropriate accommodations?

F. refusing to address Parent concerns?

6. Did Simi Valley deny Student a FAPE by materially failing to implement the following portions of Student's operative IEP from August 15, 2025, through December 11, 2025:

A. specialized academic instruction services?

B. text to speech accommodation?

C. providing Student with two sets of textbooks and classroom materials?

D. returning Student's completed work to Parents?

E. testing accommodations?

F. providing Parents with notice of upcoming work and tests?

7. Did Simi Valley deny Student a FAPE from August 15, 2025, through December 11, 2025, by amending Student's IEP without Parental consent, by:

A. removing specialized academic instruction services?

B. removing text to speech accommodation?

C. removing the accommodation to provide Student with two sets of textbooks and classroom materials?

D. removing the accommodation to return Student's completed work to Parents?

E. altering Student's one-to-one aide services?

8. Did Simi Valley deny Student a FAPE by failing to provide prior written notice:

A. regarding the refusal to change Student's classroom pursuant to Parent's September 5, 2025, request?

B. regarding specific requests Parents made during the September 11, 2025, IEP team meeting?

C. regarding the refusal of the general education teacher to meet with Parents outside of IEP team meetings?

9. Did Simi Valley deny Student a FAPE by failing to conduct an adequate speech and language assessment, with a report dated December 8, 2025?

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

The resolutions requested by Student include an IEP team meeting, full implementation of Student's operative IEP, a change in classroom placement, compensatory education, independent educational evaluations, and various changes to Student's IEP.

Simi Valley filed its response to Student's complaint on December 22, 2025. (*M.C. v. Antelope Valley Union High School Dist.* (9th Cir. 2017) 858 F.3d 1189, 1199-1200.)

EXHIBITS

The parties shall serve their exhibits on each other in compliance with Education Code section 56505, subdivision (e)(7). The parties shall upload their exhibits electronically according to the Order Setting Procedures for Filing Exhibits Electronically. Timely uploading electronic hearing exhibits five business days before the first day of hearing constitutes that party's timely exchange of evidence in compliance with Education Code section 56505, subdivision (e)(7). If further assistance is needed, please contact OAH at OAHSEOps@dgs.ca.gov.

Except for good cause shown, or unless used solely for rebuttal or impeachment, any exhibit not timely exchanged as required by Education Code section 56505,

subdivision (e)(7) shall not be admitted into evidence at the hearing unless the ALJ rules that it is admissible.

IDENTIFYING EXHIBITS AND PAGE NUMBERS

Each exhibit must be identified by a letter and number. Student must use the letter S before the number to identify Student's exhibits. Simi Valley must use the letter D before the number to identify Simi Valley's exhibits. For example, S-1 means Student's exhibit 1 and D-1 means Simi Valley's exhibit 1. A cover sheet with this identifying letter and number should be the first page of each exhibit. The electronic evidence program will automatically number the exhibits and additional page numbering or bates stamping should not be added.

CONTENT

Each exhibit must consist of one document. Separate documents may not be combined into one exhibit. Emails or letters may be consolidated into one exhibit if they are part of a single chain of messages. Exhibits should be in chronological order.

Parties should include resumes or curriculum vitae for each witness expected to testify as an expert.

Simi Valley's exhibits must include a color copy of the school calendar for each school year in question.

Electronic copies of exhibits shall be uploaded to Case Center by 5:00 PM at least five business days before the first day of hearing. Please refer to the General Order OAH issued with the Scheduling Order that contains the Order Setting Procedures for Filing Exhibits Electronically. It includes instructions for how to upload exhibits electronically. Beginning three business days before the hearing, the electronic evidence system will

not allow parties to upload exhibits unless permitted by the ALJ during the hearing at the ALJ's discretion.

WITNESSES

The parties shall serve their list of witnesses on each other in compliance with Education Code section 56505. No party shall be permitted to call any witnesses not timely disclosed except for good cause shown, supported by written declaration under penalty of perjury, and at the discretion of the ALJ.

Parties are responsible for ensuring that all participants are familiar with and follow the Instructions for Joining the Online Due Process Hearing provided with this Order. Participants who have not previously used the Zoom application, may find informative instructions by visiting, Getting Started with Zoom at https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/categories/200101697.

The parties are responsible for ensuring that witnesses join the virtual hearing room at the designated date and time to testify. Witnesses are required to join the due process hearing by computer and appear by videoconference unless they do not have the necessary computer equipment.

The parties are responsible for producing their own witnesses unless otherwise ordered by the ALJ. Parties shall make witnesses under their control reasonably available. The parties must schedule their witnesses to avoid delays in the hearing and to minimize or eliminate the need for calling witnesses out of order.

The ALJ has discretion to limit the number of witnesses and the time allowed for testimony. Education Code, section 56505.1, subdivision (h), empowers the ALJ to set a reasonable limit on the length of the hearing after consideration of four factors. The

first two factors are the issues to be heard and the complexity of facts to be proven. The second two factors are the ability of the parties or their representatives to present their respective cases and the parties' estimates of the time needed to present their cases.

MEET AND CONFER

The parties are encouraged to review and shorten their witness and exhibit lists before the hearing. Evidence may be excluded if it is repetitive, cumulative, or insufficiently probative to justify the time it would take to hear.

The parties are ordered to meet and confer no later than February 10, 2026, by 3:00 PM to discuss scheduling witnesses and how much time each witness will take. The parties shall discuss any issues related to counsel and witnesses appearing by videoconference for hearing, electronically viewing exhibits during the hearing, and subpoenas, if any. The parties should attempt to eliminate duplicate exhibits from their hearing exhibits. The parties shall discuss whether they can produce a written stipulation as to pertinent facts, contentions, resolutions and the authenticity and admissibility of documents to shorten the length of time needed for the hearing.

As part of the meet and confer process, Simi Valley shall inform Student which proposed witnesses are District employees. Simi Valley shall also identify the witnesses on Student's list that require a subpoena. Simi Valley may agree to accept service for a witness under Simi Valley's control or provide Student with the witness's most recent contact information.

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION FORM

Both parties have an ongoing obligation to ensure that OAH has current information on the Participant Information Form filed with OAH and shall file an updated Form as necessary. The Participant Information Form is not served upon the

opposing party. The ongoing obligation to ensure that the Participant Information Form filed with OAH is current does not change the parties' statutory obligation to timely disclose their witnesses to the other party(s) at least five business days prior to hearing. The parties must file an updated Participant Information Form to inform OAH of any changes, additions, or deletions, including the required information no later than 5:00 PM at least two business days before the first day of hearing.

Any contact information provided shall be used for the limited purpose of issuing subpoenas or for contacting a witness to attend the hearing. Any contact information shall not be disclosed to any other person.

EVIDENCE PRESENTATION

In an administrative proceeding, the burden of proof is ordinarily on the party requesting the hearing. (*Schaffer v. Weast* (2005) 546 U.S. 49, 62.) In this case Student requested the hearing and bears the burden of proof. Student's case-in-chief shall be presented first, followed by Simi Valley's, unless otherwise ordered.

WITNESS SCHEDULE

The parties must provide a joint proposed witness schedule to the ALJ on the first day of hearing. The schedule should include the first and last name of the witness, the witness's title, which party is calling the witness to testify, and include dates and time estimates of each witness's expected testimony. In the event an agreement cannot be reached, each party shall prepare a separate written schedule. Student must have witnesses available in case there is no agreement.

At the beginning of the hearing, the ALJ and the parties will discuss the length of time anticipated for each witness and scheduling issues for individual witnesses. The

ALJ will finalize the witness schedule. Parties must be prepared at the end of each day to discuss the witnesses to be presented the next day and the estimated time for the testimony of each witness.

SCOPE OF WITNESS EXAMINATION

Each witness will be called to testify only once, except for rebuttal purposes. All parties must examine a witness on all issues when the witness is first called to testify. Requiring a witness to appear only once takes priority over the order in which parties present their case-in-chief.

AUDIO ONLY OR TELEPHONIC TESTIMONY

Whether a witness may appear by audio only or telephone instead of videoconference is a matter within the discretion of the ALJ. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 3082, subd. (g).) Any party seeking to present a witness by audio only or telephone shall file a motion requesting permission to do so before the hearing. Any motion filed after the prehearing conference must be accompanied by a declaration stating why the motion was not filed on time as directed in the scheduling order.

ELECTRONIC RECORDINGS

AUDIO RECORDING

The attorneys for both parties requested permission to make an audio recording of the hearing for their personal note-taking needs. Permission to make an audio recording is granted, subject to the following conditions:

1. the OAH recording is the only official recording;

2. the parties shall turn their recording device on and off at the same time that the ALJ is on and off the record to avoid recording conversations while off the record;
3. operation of the party's recording mechanism will not be allowed to delay the hearing;
4. a party's recording may not be given, provided or played to a witness, or potential witness;
5. the recording is subject to the same confidentiality as the due process hearing;
6. participants shall not take screenshots of the videoconference nor share or publish any portion of the videoconference or audio recording; and
7. the parties may not use an artificial intelligence application or program to record the hearing.

VIDEO RECORDING

No party, witness or anyone else may videorecord any part of the proceedings or stream live through any means.

RECORDINGS AS EXHIBITS

Recordings may not be uploaded electronically without the ALJ's permission. The ALJ has discretion to admit or exclude evidence in the form of a recording. Any request to submit a recording shall be considered at the time of hearing.

The ALJ may grant or deny the request or grant the request subject to certain conditions. The party offering the recording must establish that all or a part of the recording is relevant. The ALJ may request a transcript of the portion of the recording requested or have the party offering the recording to provide an exact identifiable

portion of the recording the party seeks to admit. The identities of any person speaking on the portion of the tape being introduced must be established. An ALJ may allow the opposing party to offer additional portions of a recording to establish the context, or to rebut, the recording.

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION OR REIMBURSEMENT

Any party seeking reimbursement for expenditures shall present admissible evidence of these expenditures, or a stipulation to the amount of the expenditures. A party seeking compensatory education should provide evidence regarding the type, amount, duration, and need for any requested compensatory education. Documents offered as evidence to support a request for reimbursement must be separated by vendor.

MOTIONS

STUDENT'S MOTION IN LIMINE

On February 3, 2026, Student filed a motion in limine, seeking to exclude various documents Student asserts are educational records which Simi Valley has improperly failed to provide Student pursuant to multiple records requests. Student argues that Simi Valley improperly refused to provide the requested documents and should be precluded from introducing those documents at hearing.

On February 5, 2026, Simi Valley opposed Student's motion, arguing that it provided all responsive documents pursuant to Student's records requests, and that Student's challenges to Simi Valley's compliance with the California Public Records Act and Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act are not within OAH's jurisdiction. Finally, Simi Valley argues that Student's motion in limine is premature, and that Student may

object to the introduction of evidence if it is moved into evidence during the due process hearing.

On February 6, 2026, Student replied to Simi Valley's opposition. Reply briefing is not typically considered in special education proceedings, but the undersigned exercised his discretion to consider Student's reply.

A motion in limine is made to exclude evidence before it is offered at trial on grounds that would be sufficient to object to or move to strike the evidence. A motion in limine is used to preclude prejudicial or objectionable evidence before it is presented to the jury. (3 Witkin, Cal. Evid. (5th Ed. 2022) Presentation § 379; *Edwards v. Centex Real Estate Corp.* (1997) 53 Cal.App.4th 15, 26.) In special education due process hearings before OAH, the ALJ is the finder of fact, and not a jury.

Evidence should be excluded on a motion in limine only when the evidence is clearly inadmissible on all potential grounds. (See e.g., *Hawthorne Partners v. AT & T Tech., Inc.* (N.D.Ill.1993) 831 F.Supp. 1398, 1400.) "Unless evidence meets this high standard, evidentiary rulings should be deferred until trial so that questions of foundation, relevancy and potential prejudice may be resolved in proper context." (*Ibid.*) Courts considering a motion in limine may reserve judgment until trial, so that the motion is placed in the appropriate factual context. (See *Gleason v. Franklin* (C.D. Cal. October 17, 2022, No. CV 15-8380-CBM-(DFMx), 2022 WL 18399953 at *2, quoting *U.S.A. v. Jackson* (C.D. Cal. July 25, 2016, No. 2:13-CR-00674-CAS) 2016 WL 4059615 at *2 (". . . motions in limine should rarely seek to exclude broad categories of evidence, as the court is almost always better situated to rule on evidentiary issues in their factual context during trial").

Here, Student did not specifically identify documents he seeks to exclude. Rather, Student asserts that there exist responsive documents beyond what Simi Valley has provided in response to his records requests and seeks to exclude those unidentified documents. Student's argument is predicated on multiple assumptions, which Student has not yet established, including the existence of these documents, and Simi Valley's legal obligation to provide them. OAH will be better situated to rule on evidentiary issues related to specific documents if any document Student believes should be excluded is offered at hearing.

Student's motion is limine is denied without prejudice. Student may renew his objection to specific documents at the hearing if those documents are offered into evidence.

MOTION TO QUASH

On February 3, 2026, Simi Valley filed a motion to quash a subpoena for the testimony of Stephan Pietrolungo. Student opposed this motion on February 5, 2026. This motion will be addressed under a separate order.

OTHER MOTIONS

No other prehearing motions are pending or contemplated. Any motion that was not filed three business days before the PHC, shall be supported by a declaration under penalty of perjury establishing good cause why the motion was not timely filed.

STIPULATIONS

Stipulations to pertinent facts, contentions, resolutions, and authenticity of documents are encouraged. Any proposed stipulation shall be submitted to the assigned ALJ in writing prior to the start of the hearing.

CONDUCT OF PARTICIPANTS AND HEARING ROOM DECORUM

All participants to the videoconference should observe the same decorum as in an in-person due process hearing. Participants must conduct themselves in a professional and courteous manner at all times. Cellular phones, telephones and computer notifications must be shut off or set to silent during the hearing unless the ALJ grants permission otherwise. Participants should appear from a private location, unless otherwise ordered. Participants should take reasonable efforts to minimize background noise and maintain adequate room lighting. Use of virtual background images are at the discretion of the ALJ. Witnesses are prohibited from reading exhibits, documents, notes, text messages, telephones or computers while testifying, unless permitted to do so by the ALJ. The parties, their representative and witnesses are prohibited from passing notes to, exchanging electronic messages with, or signaling the witness in any way while the witness is testifying.

LANGUAGE INTERPRETERS AND REASONABLE ACCOMMODATIONS

Neither party requested an accommodation or a language interpreter.

A party or participant in this case, such as a witness, requiring reasonable accommodation to participate in a mediation or hearing may contact OAH at (916) 263-0880, or send an email to OAHADA@dgs.ca.gov as soon as the need is known. The e-mail should have "Request for Accommodation" in the Subject Line. Additional information concerning requests for reasonable accommodation is available on OAH's website at: https://www.dgs.ca.gov/OAH/Services/Page-Content/Office-of-Administrative-Hearings-Services-List-Folder/Request-Reasonable-Accommodations-for-OAH-Legal-Proceedings.

HEARING CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC

The hearing is closed to the public. Special education hearings are closed to the public unless Student requests the hearing to be open to the public.

SETTLEMENT

The parties are encouraged to continue working together to reach an agreement before the due process hearing. The parties shall inform OAH in writing immediately if they reach a settlement or otherwise resolve the dispute before the scheduled hearing. In addition, if a settlement is reached within five days of the scheduled start of the due process hearing, the parties shall also inform OAH of the settlement by telephone at (916) 263-0880. At the same time, the parties should send the signature page of the signed agreement or a letter withdrawing the case to OAH by visiting OAH Secure e-file at https://www.applications.dgs.ca.gov/oah/oahsftweb.

If a full and final written settlement agreement is reached after 4:00 PM the day prior to hearing, the parties shall leave a voicemail message regarding the settlement at (916) 274-6035. The parties should also leave contact information such as cellular phone numbers of each party or counsel for each party.

Dates for hearing will not be cancelled until the letter of withdrawal or signature page of the signed agreement has been received and processed by OAH. If an agreement in principle is reached, the parties should plan to attend the scheduled hearing unless different arrangements have been agreed upon by the assigned ALJ. The assigned ALJ will check for messages before the hearing.

If the matter settles subject to board approval, in addition to a signed copy of the signature page of the settlement agreement, the parties shall provide the date of the next board meeting. The hearing dates will not be cancelled without this information.

FAILURE TO COMPLY

The failure to comply with this Order may result in the exclusion of evidence or other sanctions.

ORDER INCLUDES ALL RULINGS

This Order includes all rulings made at the prehearing conference. Any discussion and conversation not referenced in this Order is not binding on the ALJ conducting the hearing and may not be relied upon by the parties. The parties should be aware that, at hearing, the ALJ conducting the hearing has discretion to reconsider any part of this Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Ashok Pathi

Ashok Pathi
Administrative Law Judge
Office of Administrative Hearings