BEFORE THE
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of: PARENT ON BEHALF OF STUDENT, v. GARVEY SCHOOL DISTRICT.	OAH Case No. 2017100064 ORDER DETERMINING SUFFICIENCY OF DUE PROCESS COMPLAINT

On October 2, 2017 Student filed a Due Process Hearing Request[1] (complaint) with the Office of Administrative Hearings naming Garvey School District as respondent. On October 6, 2017, Garvey filed a Notice of Insufficiency as to Student's complaint, asserting that Student's request for due process hearing failed to meet the pleading standards because Garvey does not understand the reason behind one of the proposed resolutions, specifically Student's request for a Functional Behavior Assessment.

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.)

[1] A request for a due process hearing under Education Code section 56502 is the due process complaint notice required under title 20 U.S.C. section 1415(b)(7)(A).

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 Student's complaint are sufficient to put the District on notice of the issues forming the basis of the complaint. Student's complaint identifies the issues and adequate related facts about the problem to permit District to respond to the complaint and participate in a resolution session and mediation. The proposed resolutions are only proposals and, ultimately, they are subject to proof at hearing. In either the resolution session or in mediation, Garvey will have the opportunity to discuss the basis for Student's proposed functional behavior assessment. In light of the liberal notice pleading standards applicable to IDEA due process hearing requests, as a general matter, sufficiently pleaded requests for due process should proceed to hearing, at which time, Student shall have the burden of proving the claims in his complaint.

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: October 6, 2017

DocuSigned by:
Penelope S. Pahl
B3DF836E5DA94F2...

PENELOPE S. PAHL
Administrative Law Judge
Office of Administrative Hearings