

BEFORE THE
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of:

PARENT on behalf of STUDENT,

v.

LA MESA-SPRING VALLEY SCHOOL
DISTRICT.

OAH CASE NO. 2010020497

DETERMINATION OF SUFFICIENCY
OF DUE PROCESS COMPLAINT

On February 11, 2010, Student filed a Due Process Hearing Request¹ (complaint) naming the La Mesa-Spring Valley School District (District) as the respondent.

On the February 25, 2010, the District filed a Notice of Insufficiency (NOI) as to Student's complaint.

APPLICABLE LAW

The named parties to a due process hearing request have the right to challenge the sufficiency of the complaint.² 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 (FAPE) 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.³ 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.⁴

¹ A request for a due process hearing under Education Code section 56502 is the due process complaint notice required under Title 20 United States Code section 1415(b)(7)(A).

² 20 U.S.C. § 1415(b) & (c).

³ 20 U.S.C. § 1415(b)(7)(A)(ii)(III) & (IV)

⁴ 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.”⁵ 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.⁶ Whether the complaint is sufficient is a matter within the sound discretion of the ALJ.⁷

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 the District to respond to the complaint and participate in a resolution session and mediation. It is clear from the face of the complaint that Student is challenging the District’s assessments, the appropriate placement for Student, and the failure by the District to include certain services in Student’s individualized education program (IEP), including transportation, an emergency health plan, a behavior support plan, and one-on-one assistance for goals and objectives. While the District is correct that Student’s factual allegations could be pled more specifically, the issues are sufficient to put the District on notice as to the basis for the complaint.

The issue stated in paragraph 5 on page 2 of Student’s complaint appears to be a proposed resolution, not a separate allegation charging a denial of a free appropriate public education. Student has alleged additional proposed resolutions on the final page of the complaint. Student has met the statutorily required standard of stating the resolutions to the extent known and available to Student at the time.

ORDER

1. The complaint is sufficient under section 1415(b)(7)(A)(ii).

⁵ Sen. Rep. No. 108-185, *supra*, at p. 34.

⁶ *Alexandra R. v. Brookline School Dist.* (D.N.H., Sept. 10, 2009, No. 06-cv-0215-JL) 2009 WL 2957991 at p.3 [nonpub. opn.]; *Escambia County Board 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, No. 8:04CV2657T24EAJ) 2005 WL 2850076 at p. 3[nonpub. opn.] ; but cf. *M.S.-G. v. Lenape Regional High School Dist.* (3d Cir. 2009) 306 Fed.Appx. 772, at p. 3[nonpub. opn.].

⁷ Assistance to States for the Education of Children With Disabilities and Preschool Grants for Children With Disabilities, 71 Fed.Reg. 46540-46541, 46699 (Aug. 14, 2006).

2. All mediation, prehearing conference, and hearing dates in this matter are confirmed.

Dated: February 26, 2010

/s/

SUSAN RUFF
Administrative Law Judge
Office of Administrative Hearings