

BEFORE THE
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of:

PARENTS ON BEHALF OF STUDENT,

v.

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL
DISTRICT.

OAH CASE NO. 2012080672

ORDER FOR ADDITIONAL
INFORMATION ON MOTION FOR
STAY PUT

On August 23, 2012, Student filed a motion for stay put with the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) against the Los Angeles Unified School District (District) that contended that the District refused to implement provisions of the parties' settlement agreement that resolved OAH Case Number 201201856. The District did not file a response.

APPLICABLE LAW

Until due process hearing procedures are complete, a special education student is entitled to remain in his or her current educational placement, unless the parties agree otherwise. (20 U.S.C. § 1415(j); 34 C.F.R. § 300.518(a) (2006)¹; Ed. Code, § 56505 subd. (d).) This is referred to as "stay put." For purposes of stay put, the current educational placement is typically the placement called for in the student's individualized education program (IEP), which has been implemented prior to the dispute arising. (*Thomas v. Cincinnati Bd. of Educ.* (6th Cir. 1990) 918 F.2d 618, 625.)

In California, "specific educational placement" is defined as "that unique combination of facilities, personnel, location or equipment necessary to provide instructional services to an individual with exceptional needs," as specified in the IEP. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 3042.)

The interpretation of settlement agreements is based on familiar and well-established principles of contract law. (*Miller v. Fairchild Indus.* (9th Cir. 1986) 797 F.2d 727, 733; see also *Jeff D. v. Andrus* (9th Cir. 1990) 899 F.2d 753, 759.) If a written agreement is not equivocal or ambiguous, "the writing or writings will constitute the contract of the parties,

¹ All references to the Code of Federal Regulations are to the 2006 edition, unless otherwise indicated.

and one party is not permitted to escape from its obligations by showing that he did not intend to do what his words bound him to do.” (*Brant v. California Dairies, Inc.* (1935) 4 Cal.2d 128, 134; see also 1 Witkin, Summary of Cal. Law, Contracts, § 89 [“Ordinarily, one who accepts or signs an instrument, which on its fact is a contract, is deemed to assent to all its terms”]; cf. *Skrbina v. Fleming Co., Inc.* (1996) 45 Cal.App.4th 1353, 1368 [releases must be “clear, explicit and comprehensible in each of their essential details”].) By entering into a settlement agreement, each party agrees to “extinguish those legal rights it sought to enforce through litigation in exchange for rights secured by the contract.” (*Village of Kaktovik v. Watt* (D.C.Cir. 1982) 689 F.2d 222, 230.) In addition, parties may waive claims that, at the time of the settlement agreement, are unknown to them. (Civ. Code, § 1542.)

DISCUSSION and ORDER

While Student contends that the parties’ previous settlement constitutes Student’s last agreed-upon and implemented educational placement, Student did not include a copy of the settlement agreement in the motion for stay put. Therefore, by 5:00 p.m. on September 4, 2012, the parties shall provide to OAH a copy of the settlement agreement referenced in the motion for stay put and any additional briefing as to Student’s stay put placement based on the settlement agreement. Each party shall include sworn declarations supporting any factual assertions included in its briefing.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 29, 2012

/s/

PETER PAUL CASTILLO
Administrative Law Judge
Office of Administrative Hearings