

BEFORE THE
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of:

PARENT ON BEHALF OF STUDENT,

v.

MANHATTAN BEACH UNIFIED
SCHOOL DISTRICT.

OAH CASE NO. 2010110558

DETERMINATION OF SUFFICIENCY
OF DUE PROCESS COMPLAINT

On November 15, 2010, Student filed a Due Process Hearing Request¹ (complaint) naming Manhattan Beach Unified School District (District). On November 30, 2010, District timely filed a Notice of Insufficiency (NOI), challenging the sufficiency of the notice in the complaint. As discussed below, the complaint is insufficient, however, Student will be given an opportunity to amend the 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 Administrative Law Judge.⁷

DISCUSSION

Although District challenges the sufficiency of the proposed resolutions, they are sufficient to put the District on notice that Student is seeking reimbursement for private placement, IEP eligibility, a non-public school placement, and counseling. However, absent sufficient notice of the “problem,” the complaint is still subject to dismissal.

Here, Student’s complaint is insufficient because it fails to clearly identify the nature of the problem relating to the identification, evaluation, or provision of services to Student. In particular, the “brief summary of reason for request” in the complaint appears to be a factual narrative of Student’s recent educational history, including allegations that some assessments were performed and an IEP started in October of 2010. What is missing from the complaint is any indication of what “problem” Student believes entitles him to this relief based on the facts. It simply cannot be determined whether Student is alleging a child find claim, a claim that there were procedural or substantive problems with the recent assessment and IEP, or something else. In addition, it cannot be determined what time periods or specific assessments or IEP meetings are related to the problem. In sum, the complaint is insufficient because no distinct problem or problems are identified.

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).

ORDER

1. Student's complaint is insufficiently pled under section Title 20 United States Code 1415(c)(2)(D).
2. Student shall be permitted to file an amended complaint under Title 20 United States Code section 1415(c)(2)(E)(i)(II).⁸
3. The amended complaint shall comply with the requirements of Title 20 United States Code section 1415(b)(7)(A)(ii), and shall be filed not later than 14 days from the date of this order.
4. If Student fails to file a timely amended complaint, the complaint will be dismissed.
5. All dates previously set in this matter are vacated.

Dated: December 2, 2010

/s/

RICHARD T. BREEN
Administrative Law Judge
Office of Administrative Hearings

⁸ The filing of an amended complaint will restart the applicable timelines for a due process hearing.