

Priority _____
Send _____
Enter _____
Closed _____
~~JS-5/JS-6~~ _____
JS-2/JS-3 _____
Scan Only _____

FILED
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
AUG 14 2007
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
DEPUTY
BY [Signature]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
WESTERN DIVISION

ENTERED
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
AUG 17 2007
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
DEPUTY
BY [Signature]

C.S., a minor, Identified through the Office of
Administrative hearings, OAH No.)
N2005110775, by and through his natural
parents, WENDY [REDACTED], and KEN
[REDACTED], Guardians ad litem,
Plaintiff,
vs.
CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF
ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS, et al,
Defendants.

^{ED}
Case No. CV 06-0842 ODW (OPx)
ORDER AFFIRMING
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S
DECISION

This appeal concerns an Administrative Due Process hearing under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act ("IDEA"), 20 U.S.C. 1415 et seq. Plaintiff C.S., through his parents, appeals the Administrative Law Judge's ("ALJ") decision in favor of Defendants Desert Sands Unified School District ("DSUSD") and Riverside Unified School District ("RUSD").

29

1 The ALJ found that DSUSD made reasonable attempts to comply with the
2 procedural requirements for the transition and assessment of C.S., but that the parents'
3 actions did not allow DSUSD to conduct the assessment required by the IDEA. The ALJ
4 also determined that the March 8, 2005 meeting was not a final IEP but an initial meeting
5 to get the parents' consent for the initial assessment. The ALJ found that the placement
6 offered at that meeting was made on an "interim" basis to avoid any interruption in C.S.'s
7 services. (A.R. 02184-02185.)

8 As to RUSD, the ALJ found: (1) RUSD's July 14, 2006 meeting was not pre-
9 determined; (2) the parents meaningfully participated in the IEP meeting; (3) a general
10 education teacher was not required because general education was not being considered
11 for C.S.; (4) the personnel conducting the evaluation were qualified; and (5) RUSD's test
12 results were valid. (A.R. 02185-02186.) The ALJ also found that C.S. was not entitled
13 to reimbursement for Dr. Lenington's evaluation because it did not satisfy requirements
14 for an independent educational evaluation ("IEE") and C.S. was not entitled to
15 reimbursement for the LIFE program because his parents did not give RUSD the
16 opportunity to make a formal offer of placement. (AR. at 92187-02188.)

17 The ALJ's factual findings are supported by the record and her legal conclusions are
18 sound. Accordingly, the ALJ's decision is hereby AFFIRMED.

19
20 IT IS SO ORDERED

21
22 DATED: August 11, 2007

23
24 
25 _____
26 OTIS D. WRIGHT II
27 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
28