BEFORE THE
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE MATTER OF:

PARENTS ON BEHALF OF STUDENT,

v.

HUNTINGTON BEACH CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT.

OAH CASE NUMBER 2026031081

ORDER DETERMINING DUE PROCESS COMPLAINT SUFFICIENT

APRIL 10, 2026

On March 24, 2026, Student filed a due process hearing request, called a complaint, with the Office of Administrative Hearings, referred to as OAH, naming Huntington Beach City School District. On April 9, 2026, Huntington Beach City filed a notice of insufficiency as to the complaint.

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, or FAPE; (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.)

Student alleges one issue in the complaint. Huntington Beach City argues the issue is insufficiently pled because it fails to describe a problem during a time that Huntington Beach City was responsible for Student. Huntington Beach City also argues

the proposed resolution is not related to when Huntington Beach City was responsible for Student.

Student's sole issue is if Huntington Beach City denied Student a FAPE by failing to facilitate a transition individualized education program team meeting with Huntington Beach Union High School District. Student was in eighth grade during the 2024-2025 school year. Huntington Beach City is a kindergarten through eighth grade school district. Huntington Beach Union is the high school district Student was matriculating into. Student explicitly states the chronology of events between January 2025 and July 2025, when the parties were discussing high school testing and a transition meeting. Student concludes the complaint by stating the parties never met for a transition meeting and alleges Huntington Beach City was responsible for facilitating that meeting which would determine Student's placement for the 2025-2026 school year.

The facts alleged in Student's complaint are adequate for Huntington Beach City to have an awareness and understanding of the issues forming the basis of the complaint. Huntington Beach City's argument is that it was not responsible for Student for the 2025-2026 school year, and Student did not explain how Huntington Beach City had a duty to offer Student FAPE or make any decisions regarding Student's placement for the 2025-2026 school year. Student's issue is clear; the allegation is Huntington Beach City failed to facilitate a transition meeting which denied him FAPE. Whether failing to facilitate a transition meeting amounted to a FAPE denial that Huntington Beach City was responsible for is an issue for hearing.

Student requests reimbursement and compensatory education as proposed resolutions. A complaint is required to include proposed resolutions to the problem, to

the extent known and available to the party at the time. (20 U.S.C. §1415(b)(7)(A)(ii)(IV).) Student has met the statutorily required standard regarding proposed resolutions.

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.

Linda Dowd

Linda Dowd

Administrative Law Judge

Office of Administrative Hearings