

BEFORE THE
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of:

TORRANCE UNIFIED SCHOOL
DISTRICT,

v.

PARENT ON BEHALF OF STUDENT.

OAH CASE NO. 2013110362

ORDER DENYING WITHOUT
PREJUDICE DISTRICT'S REQUEST
FOR CONTINUANCE

On November 21, 2013, District filed a request for continuance of the hearing dates. The matter is currently set for hearing on December 3, 2013.

A due process hearing must be conducted and a decision rendered within 45 days of receipt of the due process notice unless an extension is granted for good cause. (34 C.F.R. § 300.515(a) & (c) (2006); Ed. Code, §§ 56502, subd. (f), 56505, subd. (f)(3); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 1, § 1020.) As a result, continuances are disfavored. Good cause may include the unavailability of a party, counsel, or an essential witness due to death, illness or other excusable circumstances; substitution of an attorney when the substitution is required in the interests of justice; a party's excused inability to obtain essential testimony or other material evidence despite diligent efforts; or another significant, unanticipated change in the status of the case as a result of which the case is not ready for hearing. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.1332(c).) OAH considers all relevant facts and circumstances, including the proximity of the hearing date; previous continuances or delays; the length of continuance requested; the availability of other means to address the problem giving rise to the request; prejudice to a party or witness as a result of a continuance; the impact of granting a continuance on other pending hearings; whether trial counsel is engaged in another trial; whether the parties have stipulated to a continuance; whether the interests of justice are served by the continuance; and any other relevant fact or circumstance. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.1332(d).)

OAH has reviewed the request for good cause and considered all relevant facts and circumstances. The request is:

Denied. All prehearing conference and hearing dates are confirmed and shall proceed as calendared. Here, District's counsel asserts that she is not available for hearing on the date originally set because she is scheduled to attend an IEP meeting. She also asserts that the parties want to mediate this matter before going to hearing. While OAH is inclined to grant a continuance, Parent has not signed the request for continuance, and there is no evidence that the parties have mutually agreed on new dates. Instead, the evidence establishes that District has attempted to contact Parent,

who allegedly agreed to continue the matter, but who has not yet responded to the dates proposed by District's counsel's assistant. For that reason, the request is denied, without prejudice to the right of the parties to jointly seek a continuance once they have agreed on dates. The parties may re-submit the request to continue after they have agreed upon hearing dates. If the parties are unable to agree on hearing dates, they may request OAH to select dates.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 21, 2013

/s/

ADRIENNE L. KRIKORIAN
Administrative Law Judge
Office of Administrative Hearings