

BEFORE THE  
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of:

EDUCATION RIGHTS HOLDERS ON  
BEHALF OF STUDENT,

v.

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL  
DISTRICT.

OAH CASE NO. 2013110281

ORDER OF DETERMINATION OF  
SUFFICIENCY OF DUE PROCESS  
COMPLAINT

On November 5, 2013, Student's parents, holder of Student's education rights, on behalf of Student (Student) filed with the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) a Due Process Hearing Request<sup>1</sup> (complaint) naming the San Francisco Unified School District (District) as respondent. The District received a copy of the complaint by facsimile on October 30, 2013.

On November 14, 2013, 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.<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

---

<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).

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>

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 a single claim, which is insufficiently pled as discussed below. The sole claim alleged is whether Student has received a free appropriate public education (FAPE) at the District operated Community Access Transition class (CAT). Student alleges that she is not receiving “the needed academics and supports from this SFUSD class.” Student seeks an order from OAH to compel the District to fund Student’s placement at another program, UCLA Pathways (Pathways).

In the complaint, Student alleges that (1) she is “not progressing academically,” (2) she does not have “an appropriate peer group” at CAT, and (3) she was directed by the Golden Gate Regional Center to seek funding for Pathways from the District.

---

<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.

<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).

Student's complaint is insufficiently pled in that it fails to provide the District with the required notice of a description of the problem and the facts relating to the problem. Student fails to allege facts to demonstrate why CAT is not providing Student with "needed academics" or what supports she requires and how CAT is not providing such supports. Student also fails to allege what her "appropriate peer group" is and how the CAT class is deficient in providing an appropriate peer group.

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).<sup>8</sup>
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: November 19, 2013

/s/

---

ROBERT HELFAND  
Administrative Law Judge  
Office of Administrative Hearings

---

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