

BEFORE THE  
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of:

PARENT ON BEHALF OF STUDENT,

v.

TEMECULA VALLEY UNIFIED  
SCHOOL DISTRICT.

OAH CASE NO. 2010080285

ORDER OF DETERMINATION OF  
SUFFICIENCY OF DUE PROCESS  
COMPLAINT

On August 06, 2010, Kathleen M. Loyer, attorney for Student, filed a Due Process Hearing Request<sup>1</sup> (complaint) against the Temecula Valley Unified School District (District). On August 11, 2010, Peter A. Sansom, attorney for 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.<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> 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).

<sup>2</sup> 20 U.S.C. § 1415(b) & (c).

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

<sup>4</sup> 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.”<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup> Whether the complaint is sufficient is a matter within the sound discretion of the Administrative Law Judge.<sup>7</sup>

## DISCUSSION

Student raises three issues for resolution. First, Student contends that District failed to offer him a FAPE since August 2009, when it developed an individualized education program (IEP) that did not provide measurable goals, support services and accommodations in all areas of need. Student specifically lists each area of need which he asserts District’s IEP failed to address. Second, Student asserts District denied him a FAPE when it failed to conduct appropriate assessments in the areas of social emotional functioning, written language and fine motor skills. Finally, Student alleges that he was denied a FAPE when District failed to find him eligible for special education under the category of emotionally disturbed. The body of the complaint provides a sufficient factual basis for each of Student’s three issues.

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 problems to permit District to respond to the complaint and participate in a resolution session and mediation. Accordingly, Student’s complaint is sufficient.

## ORDER

1. The complaint is sufficient under section title 20 United States Code section 1415(b)(7)(A)(ii).

---

<sup>5</sup> Sen. Rep. No. 108-185, *supra*, at p. 34.

<sup>6</sup> *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.].

<sup>7</sup> 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 calendared dates in this matter are confirmed.

Dated: August 13, 2010

/s/

---

BOB VARMA  
Administrative Law Judge  
Office of Administrative Hearings