BEFORE THE
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Consolidated Matters of: PARENT ON BEHALF OF STUDENT, v. LOWELL JOINT SCHOOL DISTRICT,	OAH Case No. 2015100100
LOWELL JOINT SCHOOL DISTRICT, v. PARENT ON BEHALF OF STUDENT.	OAH Case No. 2015100387 ORDER DETERMINING DISTRICT'S AMENDED COMPLAINT SUFFICIENT

On November 23, 2015, OAH issued an order granting Lowell Joint School District's motion to amend complaint and deemed the amended complaint filed the date of the order. Student timely filed a Notice of Partial Insufficiency as to District's amended complaint on December 8, 2015.

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 District's amended complaint are sufficient to put the Student on notice of the issues forming the basis of the complaint. The issues in the consolidated matters concern assessments conducted as part of a comprehensive evaluation of Student in April and May of 2015. The issues in the amended complaint concern whether IEP's dated April 22, 2015, May 18, 2015, and October 8, 2015, offered Student a FAPE. District seeks an order that the assessments were appropriate and that the IEP's offered Student a FAPE in the least restrictive environment. District's amended complaint identifies the issues and adequate related facts about the problem to permit Student to respond to the amended complaint, participate in mediation, and prepare for the due process hearing.

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 are confirmed.

DATE: December 09, 2015

/s/

MARIAN H. TULLY
Administrative Law Judge
Office of Administrative Hearings