BEFORE THE
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE MATTER OF:

PARENT ON BEHALF OF STUDENT,

v.

MURRIETA VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT.

OAH CASE NUMBER 2026030986

ORDER CLARIFYING ISSUES FOR HEARING

JUNE 16, 2026

On May 22, 2026, Administrative Law Judge Thanayi Lindsey, 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. On May 29, 2026, OAH issued an Order Following Prehearing Conference.

On May 29, 2026, ALJ Jeanie Min granted Student's request for a continuance of the due process hearing and continued the hearing to commence on June 16, 2026. On June 16, 2026, ALJ Min held the due process hearing by videoconference. Parent appeared on behalf of Student. Student also attended the hearing. Attorney Peter Sansom represented Murrieta Valley Unified School District. Assistant Director of Special Education Steven Gooch appeared on behalf of Murrieta Valley.

At the outset of the hearing on June 16, 2026, the parties had a discussion with the ALJ to clarify the issues for hearing. Based upon the discussion with the parties, the ALJ issues the following order clarifying the issues for hearing.

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

ISSUES

1. Did Murrieta Valley deny Student a FAPE by failing to keep accurate educational records, in that Murrieta Valley identified Student by the incorrect name and failed to distinguish Student's disability and educational history from his brother's?
2. Did Murrieta Valley fail to timely locate, identify, or evaluate Student under its child find obligation, between the beginning of the 2024-2025 school year to the time he was initially assessed around October 2025?
3. Did Murrieta Valley deny Student a FAPE by failing to appropriately assess in all areas of known or suspected disability, specifically, Student's vision impairment, as part of his initial assessment from around October 2025 to March 23, 2026?
4. Did Murrieta Valley deny Student a FAPE by failing to find Student eligible for special education under the category of visual impairment at the December 12, 2025 IEP team meeting?
5. Did Murrieta Valley deny Student a FAPE by failing to offer any visual impairment services in the December 12, 2025 IEP?
6. Did Murrieta Valley deny Student a FAPE by failing to offer appropriate visual impairment services in the February 26, 2026 IEP?

7. Did Murrieta Valley deny Student a FAPE by denying Student participation in extracurricular activities between August 2024 and March 23, 2026?

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Jeanie Min

Jeanie Min

Administrative Law Judge

Office of Administrative Hearings