

BEFORE THE  
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of:

PARENT ON BEHALF OF STUDENT,

v.

TORRANCE UNIFIED SCHOOL  
DISTRICT.

OAH CASE NO. 2012110043

ORDER OF DETERMINATION OF  
SUFFICIENCY OF DUE PROCESS  
COMPLAINT

On October 31, 2012, Student filed a due process hearing request<sup>1</sup> (complaint) naming the Torrance Unified School District (District).

On November 14, 2012, District filed a timely 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

---

<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).

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>

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’s complaint alleges that Student, a 9-year old boy with disabilities resulting from brain surgery similar to symptoms of traumatic brain injury and eligible for special education under the categories of other health impairment and speech and language impairment, has not been assessed or had his individualized education program (IEP) updated since March 2010. He alleges that despite Student exhibiting multiple educational, developmental and social deficits in the school setting, District failed to hold an annual IEP team meeting in 2011, or to conduct a triennial IEP team meeting in April 2012. Student also alleges that the annual IEP developed at the April 12, 2012 IEP team meeting failed to offer him a FAPE. Student claims that District has failed to provide him with a FAPE since October 30, 2010, including a failure to offer a FAPE for the 2012-2013 school year. Student seeks compensatory services, as well as reimbursement for identified services provided by Parents and placement in an appropriate program for the 2012-2013 school year.<sup>8</sup>

---

<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.

<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).

<sup>8</sup> Student also seeks an order that District comply with a California Department of Education compliance order.

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 District to respond to the complaint and participate in a resolution session and mediation.

Therefore, Student's statement of his claim that District has failed to provide him with a FAPE from October 30, 2010 through the 2012-2013 school year is sufficient.

#### ORDER

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

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

Dated: November 15, 2012

/s/

---

ALEXA J. HOHENSEE  
Administrative Law Judge  
Office of Administrative Hearings