BEFORE THE
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE MATTER OF:

PARENTS ON BEHALF OF STUDENT,

v.

RAMONA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT .

OAH CASE NUMBER 2026040006

ORDER DETERMINING DUE PROCESS COMPLAINT SUFFICIENT

APRIL 14, 2026

On March 27, 2026, Student filed a Due Process Hearing Request, called a complaint, with the Office of Administrative Hearings, referred to as OAH, naming Ramona Unified School District. On April 10, 2026, Ramona filed a Notice of Insufficiency as to the complaint.

APPLICABLE LAW

The named parties have the right to challenge the complaint's sufficiency. (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: (1) describes the problem relating to the proposed change regarding the Student's identification, evaluation, or educational placement, or providing the Student a free appropriate public education; (2) includes facts about the problem; and (3) includes a proposed resolution 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 complaint contains three issues, each with multiple sub-issues. Ramona contends the complaint is vague, because it does not identify a single operative individualized education program, called an IEP, meeting date, or written offer that allegedly resulted in a denial of a free appropriate public education, called a FAPE. However, Student's "facts related to the problem" section of the complaint identifies IEP meetings, dates, offers, IEPs, and other facts connected to the issues and sub-issues pled in Student's "issues" section of the complaint. Further, Ramona contends it cannot determine whether the allegations are barred by the statute of limitations. However, Student asserts in a footnote on page two of the complaint that Student does not intend to raise claims outside the statute of limitations.

For all these reasons, Student's complaint identifies the issues and adequate facts about the problem to permit Ramona to respond and participate in a resolution session and mediation. Therefore, Student's statement of three issues, including sub-issues, is sufficient.

ORDER

1. The complaint is sufficient under title 20 United States Code section 1415(b)(7)(A)(ii).
2. All prehearing conference and hearing dates in this matter are confirmed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Daniel Senter

Daniel Senter

Administrative Law Judge

Office of Administrative Hearings