1	XAVIER BECERRA Attorney General of California	
2	MICHAEL L. NEWMAN Senior Assistant Attorney General	
3	SARAH E. BELTON	
4	Supervising Deputy Attorney General LAURA FAER (SBN 233846)	
5	Deputy Attorney General 1515 Clay Street, 20th Floor	
6	P.O. Box 70550 Oakland, CA 94612-0550	
7	Telephone: (510) 879-3304 E-mail: Laura.Faer@doj.ca.gov	
8	Attorneys for THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE O CALIFORNIA	F
9	SUPERIOR COURT OF TH	E STATE OF CALIFORNIA
10		LOS ANGELES
11	COUNTION	LOS ANGLELS
12		
13	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, EX. REL. XAVIER	Case No.
14	BECERRA, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,	COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF
15	Plaintiff,	
16	<b>v.</b>	
17		
18	MOJAVE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,	
18 19	MOJAVE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, Defendant	
	Defendant	
19	Defendant The People of the State of California, by	and through Xavier Becerra, Attorney General of
19 20	Defendant The People of the State of California, by the State of California, allege on information and	l belief as follows:
19 20 21	Defendant The People of the State of California, by the State of California, allege on information and <b>JURISDICTIO</b>	l belief as follows: N AND VENUE
19 20 21 22	Defendant The People of the State of California, by the State of California, allege on information and <b>JURISDICTIO</b> 1. This Court has jurisdiction over the a	d belief as follows: <b>N AND VENUE</b> allegations and subject matter of the People's
<ol> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> </ol>	Defendant The People of the State of California, by the State of California, allege on information and <b>JURISDICTIO</b> 1. This Court has jurisdiction over the a Complaint filed in this action and the parties to the	d belief as follows: <b>N AND VENUE</b> allegations and subject matter of the People's his action; venue is proper in this County; and
<ol> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> </ol>	Defendant The People of the State of California, by the State of California, allege on information and <b>JURISDICTIO</b> 1. This Court has jurisdiction over the a Complaint filed in this action and the parties to the this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Judgment	d belief as follows: <b>N AND VENUE</b> allegations and subject matter of the People's his action; venue is proper in this County; and
<ol> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> <li>25</li> </ol>	Defendant The People of the State of California, by the State of California, allege on information and <b>JURISDICTIO</b> 1. This Court has jurisdiction over the a Complaint filed in this action and the parties to the this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Judgment	d belief as follows: <b>N AND VENUE</b> allegations and subject matter of the People's his action; venue is proper in this County; and
<ol> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> <li>25</li> <li>26</li> </ol>	Defendant The People of the State of California, by the State of California, allege on information and <b>JURISDICTIO</b> 1. This Court has jurisdiction over the a Complaint filed in this action and the parties to the this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Judgment	d belief as follows: <b>N AND VENUE</b> allegations and subject matter of the People's his action; venue is proper in this County; and

1 2. Plaintiff Xavier Becerra is the Attorney General of the State of California. The 2 Attorney General is the chief law officer of the state and has the duty to see that the State's laws 3 are uniformly and adequately enforced for the protection of public rights and interests. (Cal. 4 Const., art. V, § 13.) 5 3. Defendant Mojave Unified School District (Defendant or the District) receives state 6 funds, is a public school district organized and existing under the laws of the State of California, 7 and is responsible for providing public education to District students. 8 FACTUAL BACKGROUND 9 4. The right to education is a fundamental right and students have a right to both 10 substantive and procedural due process. (Serrano v. Priest (1971) 5 Cal.3d 584, 608-609, 616-11 617.) The State of California and the District are required to ensure that all students, regardless of 12 national origin, ethnicity, and immigration status, are treated equally in all aspects of education. 13 (Cal. Const., art. I, § 7, subds. (a)-(b); Ed. Code, §§ 220, 262.3, & 262.4; Butt v. State of 14 *California* (1992) 4 Cal.4th 668, 685–686.) 15 5. In May 2019, the Attorney General's office began an investigation to determine 16 whether the District's policies and practices had subjected student and his family and others 17 similarly situated to denial of educational opportunity, benefit, or access on account of advocacy 18 for rights under state law and/or based on national origin, ethnicity, or immigration status. On 19 October 24, 2019, the California Department of Education notified the Parties that it had referred 20 its investigation of allegations by and his family against the District of retaliation and 21 discrimination and improper use of independent study, supervised suspension, special education 22 evaluation processes, school removal, and search and seizure tactics to the Attorney General's 23 office for appropriate action. 24 6. The Attorney General's office conducted a comprehensive investigation of the 25 aforementioned allegations as to and his family and others similarly situated. The investigation included review of thousands of pages of District documents and data regarding 26 27 student and independent study, supervised suspension, and involuntary transfer and

28

disenrollment practices, oral examinations taken under oath, and interviews of more than twelve
 witnesses.

7. Upon conclusion of the investigation, in January 2020, the Attorney General's office found that the District failed to: (a) implement a legally compliant procedure for responding to complaints of discrimination and retaliation; and (b) timely and properly investigate and respond to allegations of retaliation by a former District principal against **1**, his family, and a District staff member. The investigation identified a violation of anti-retaliation law with respect to the actions taken by a former District principal against **1**, his family, and a District staff member.

8. The investigation also identified deficiencies under state law in the District's
independent study and supervised suspension programs, search and seizure practices, special
education evaluation and alternative placement in County Community Day School processes, and
student record confidentiality training and protocols.

13 9. The Parties have worked cooperatively to agree to a remedial plan that includes, but is not limited to: (1) a four-year monitoring period; (2) designation of a District-wide anti-14 15 discrimination coordinator responsible for reviewing and responding to all complaints consistent 16 with law; (3) revisions to discrimination and retaliation grievance procedures; (4) training for 17 school staff and leadership in anti-bias strategies, discrimination and retaliation law, grievance 18 procedures, and confidentiality; (5) development of a centralized tracking and response system 19 for all reports and complaints of discrimination and retaliation; and (6) review of District 20 discrimination, harassment, and retaliation reports and complaint investigations and responses to 21 ensure compliance with state law and implementing regulation.

10. The District has begun to take positive steps to revise policies and procedures and
implement the remedial plan. The District has eliminated the in-school suspension program at its
school-site. The District has agreed to conduct quarterly audits of students in the independent
study program for review by the Attorney General's office, provide annual training to staff on
independent study legal requirements, and contract with an independent expert to assess whether
students involuntarily transferred to a County Community Day School were improperly
transferred and ensure immediate reenrollment in the District for students who want to return.

1 The District is in the process of revising its special education evaluation policies and procedures 2 to ensure compliance with state law. In addition, the District will provide equitable relief in the 3 form of a bank of one hundred and twenty-five hours of compensatory education and mental 4 health services to 5 A. FAILURE TO IMPLEMENT A LEGALLY COMPLIANT PROCEDURE FOR **RESPONDING TO ORAL REPORTS AND WRITTEN COMPLAINTS OF** 6 DISCRIMINATION, HARASSMENT, INTIMIDATION, AND RETALIATION. 7 11. The Attorney General's investigation revealed that the District failed to have a 8 consistently identified Uniform Complaint Procedures Coordinator during the 2016-17 through 9 2018-19 school years, and a consistent system to respond to and track oral and written complaints 10 received at the school site and the District office. 11 12. The District did not provide Uniform Complaint Procedures information and 12 complaint forms to parents alleging discrimination, harassment, and retaliation on most 13 occasions. This failure resulted in parents, including **set and a state-law** 's parent, being deprived of state-law 14 protected rights, such as the right to appeal to the California Department of Education and to a 15 written decision of findings. 16 13. Although the Uniform Complaint Procedures investigation process requires the 17 District to interview parties and witnesses, issue a written decision with the right to appeal, and 18 provide the parties with the opportunity to present evidence, the District's process did not include 19 these required steps in all cases. 20 14. During the 2016-17 through 2018-19 school years, the District did not provide 21 staff training regarding the Uniform Complaint Procedures and anti-discrimination and anti-22 retaliation requirements with respect to national origin, ethnicity, and immigration status. Some 23 District staff were unaware of their role in reporting complaints to designated compliance staff. 24 15. The investigation found one or more District annual notices deficient for the 25 failure to include immigration as a protected category, apply the Uniform Complaint Procedures 26 to retaliation complaints, and provide notice that investigations shall proceed regardless of 27 whether a complaint is in writing. 28 4

1 2 B.

## FAILURE TO APPROPRIATELY AND TIMELY RESPOND TO NOTICE OF DISCRIMINATION AND RETALIATION AND FAILURE OF RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEES TO REPORT THE SAME.

The Attorney General's investigation identified that District leadership received an 16. 3 4 oral complaint from 's parent that a former District principal had threatened 's parents' employer with immigration consequences if **s** is family's employment was not terminated. 5 Approximately one month prior to receiving this oral complaint, the District received 17. 6 written notice that a civil rights advocacy organization was representing and his family to 7 address concerns about discriminatory treatment. 8 The Attorney General's investigation found that no one in the District's 9 18.

administrative office took any action to investigate signal 's complaint of discrimination and
retaliation, other than requesting a response by electronic mail from a former District principal.
The District did not offer signal 's family the Uniform Complaint Procedures, interview any
witnesses, make any findings, or issue a determination. The District failed to timely investigate
and respond to the allegations of discrimination.

15 19. When is parent complained a second time to a school-site staff member in
16 leadership, this staff member did not timely report the complaint to the District administrative
17 office or the designated compliance officer.

20. The Attorney General's investigation found that the District's failure to provide
appropriate staff training regarding anti-retaliation protections and reporting obligations and to
provide proper notice of the District's compliance coordinator contributed to this failure.

21 21. The Attorney General's investigation also found, based on the testimony of four
witnesses and other evidence, that a former District principal made threatening and disparaging
statements to statements to statements is family's employer that resulted in the family's employment being
terminated.

25 22. After learning of these statements and not receiving any response from the District,
26 stamily reasonably feared further adverse action by a former District principal. With the
27 support of a school-site administrator, sparent decided to place on independent study,
28 even though it was not in his best interest, because the independent study program did not provide

adequate support for him and he was already behind academically. Shortly thereafter, because of
 the actions by a former District principal, \_\_\_\_\_''s family removed \_\_\_\_\_ from the District and
 enrolled him in another school district.

23. Based on the timing between the family's civil rights advocacy for and notice of
the same to the District and a former District principal on or about December 6, 2018, and the
actions taken later that same month to negatively affect the family's employment, the Attorney
General's office found a prima facie case of retaliation. The Attorney General's office also found
that the District did not defend the action taken or provide any legitimate reason for the action.

9 24. The investigation also raised concerns that a former District principal may have taken 10 another adverse action against **o** on account of the protected activity of subsequently initiating 11 a complaint with the California Department of Education, when, in May 2019, she directed staff 12 not to send written notice to **o** that he could not participate in end of year events, even though 13 such notice was provided to other affected students as a matter of course.

14 25. The Attorney General's investigation also found that the District failed to investigate 15 a staff member's allegation of retaliation by a former District principal after the District's 16 administrative office received notice of alleged retaliation in Spring 2019. The investigation 17 separately found that a former District principal retaliated against a staff member by taking away 18 specific duties and removing the staff member from important meetings, after the staff member 19 confronted her regarding the allegations of unlawful behavior toward and his family and 20 stated that a report would be made to the District's administrative office, if asked.

21

C.

## **REMOVAL AND POTENTIAL LOSS OF CONFIDENTIAL STUDENT RECORDS.**

22 26. The Attorney General's investigation also revealed that, on June 18, 2019, after a
23 former District principal received the electronic subpoena from that Attorney General's office
24 directing all staff members in the District not to remove anything from the District, a former
25 District principal sent an electronic mail copy of some of \_\_\_\_\_\_''s student records to a personal
26 email address.

27 27. The Attorney General's investigation also identified that District staff received
28 written notice that supervised suspension program records, including series 's records, were

missing after a Spring 2019 school break-in. No one in the District conducted an investigation
 regarding this issue or reported the concern to any potentially impacted families.

3 28. The Attorney General's investigation also raised concerns that training regarding
4 confidentiality of student records for staff who regularly handle student records was inadequate
5 because evidence gathered failed to identify any staff members who had received training on
6 confidentiality of students records from the District.

7 8

### D. IMPORTANT ASPECTS OF THE DISTRICT'S PRACTICES WITH RESPECT TO PLACEMENT, TRACKING, AND EVALUATION OF STUDENTS IN INDEPENDENT STUDY ARE LEGALLY DEFICIENT.

9 The Attorney General's investigation found that the District provided insufficient 29. 10 protection for parents and guardians of students facing discipline who were placed in the 11 independent study program at one of the District's schools. The Attorney General's investigation 12 raised concerns that the District engaged in practices, including presenting independent study as 13 the only option for students facing discipline, that were inconsistent with state law requiring 14 independent study to be a voluntary school option. While District policy did not permit staff to 15 place students in independent study to address discipline issues, the District nevertheless 16 authorized the practice.

17 For students below grade level, the District provided only ten to fifteen minutes of 30. 18 support per week, and the District did not have a process for providing the supports necessary for 19 students below grade level to receive educational benefit and be successful, as required. The 20 investigation raised significant concerns that the independent study program did not meet the 21 legal requirement of "equivalent quality and rigor" to the classroom instruction available to other 22 students. Students could also be in the program for multiple years, raising additional concerns 23 that such long-term placement has occurred without timely evaluations and findings regarding 24 students' best interests.

31. The District did not have adequate training for staff implementing independent study
to ensure compliance or a process to assess whether a student who was behind academically
required special education prior to placement.

28

1 32. The investigation revealed that **see**'s parent was informed that placement in 2 independent study in February 2018 was the only option available to **state**, if he did not want to 3 be referred for expulsion. During placement in independent study, fell further behind grade 4 level and missed close to 46 days of independent study instruction, but the District did not 5 evaluate whether his continued placement was appropriate or record findings regarding the same, 6 as required. 7 33. The District failed to produce annual data intended to assist the District with 8 identifying whether independent study placement meets state law requirements and student needs. 9 E. SUPERVISED SUSPENSION PRACTICES AT A DISTRICT SCHOOL VIOLATED **STATE LAW REQUIREMENTS.** 10 11 34. The Attorney General's investigation revealed that the supervised suspension 12 program in the District's Middle School did not have a credentialed teacher for at least half of a 13 school year, students received an hour less of school time each day for one or more school years, 14 counseling services were provided infrequently, time in supervised suspension was not recorded 15 as required, and maximum time limits for placement in suspension per disciplinary incident and 16 per year were not followed. 17 District records show that during his eighth grade year, the District removed 35. 18 from school for 35 days, including multiple days of supervised suspension, a total for the year 19 that exceeded the 20-day state law maximum. 20 The District did not have a system to track in-school suspension days for students 36. 21 with special needs in relation to the legal requirement to hold a manifestation determination 22 meeting. 23 37. The District has discontinued its supervised suspension program at its Middle School as of June 2020. 24 25 F. THE DISTRICT'S SEARCH AND SEIZURE PRACTICES RAISED COMPLIANCE **CONCERNS.** 26 27 38. The investigation revealed that on several occasions during the 2018-19 school year, 28 the backpacks of students in entire classrooms or grade levels were searched based on a report

1	that a few students were in possession of drugs on campus and that prior to every field trip the
2	backpacks of all students participating in the field trip were searched.
3	39. The District has no policies or procedures in place that would permit random searches
4	of the kind identified during the investigation, and the investigation showed that school
5	administrators had not received training to conduct searches and were not familiar with Board
6	policy requirements on searches and seizures.
7 8	G. THE DISTRICT'S IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CHILD FIND AND SPECIAL EDUCATION EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS ARE LEGALLY DEFICIENT.
9	40. The Attorney General's investigation raised significant concerns because was
10	not timely referred for a special education evaluation, even though an aide requested one in 2017,
11	and school records identified a potential disability, and no evidence was provided of training for
12	staff on the process required under state law to identify students with suspected disabilities.
13	41. After sparent made a written request for a special education evaluation in May
14	2019, the District acknowledged that instead of providing one, a screening was initiated without
15	notice to or consent of sparent, procedures for screening were not followed, and was
16	denied a special education evaluation, in part due to the District's placement of in
17	independent study.
18	42. The District has discontinued its special education screening process, which did not
19	provide an opportunity for parental notice or consent prior to evaluation and employed screening
20	criteria that was not disclosed to parents or routinely followed.
21 22	H. THE DISTRICT MAY HAVE IMPROPERLY TRANSFERRED STUDENTS TO COUNTY COMMUNITY DAY SCHOOL AND IMPROPERLY RECORDED SUCH TRANSFERS.
23	43. The Attorney General's investigation revealed that the District's Middle School
24	Handbook stated that the "suspension for a period of 20 days during the school year will result" in
25	referral to alternative placement (or expulsion). However, suspension of a student for a 20-day
26	period is not a legally permissible reason to involuntarily transfer a student to a County
27	Community Day School.
28	
	9

1 44. Parents of Middle School students did not receive documentation explaining the right 2 to object to placement when transfer to a County Community Day School occurs outside of the 3 expulsion process and evidence suggested that involuntary placement in a County Community 4 Day School may have been used to remove students and families for improper reasons, such as 5 animus toward a particular family or student.

6 45. District data reflected a number of students from the Middle School placed in a 7 County Community Day School with a record notation of "moved," raising concerns about 8 improper placement.

9 10

#### I. INSUFFICIENT STAFF TO PROVIDE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION **SERVICES.**

11 46. The Attorney General's investigation raised concerns regarding meaningful access for 12 some parents because the Middle School did not have an assigned bilingual aide for at least the 13 first half of the 2019-20 school year and, on several occasions, staff improperly asked a student to 14 translate for a parent.

15

24

27

#### J. **PROPOSED RESOLUTION BY THE PARTIES**

16 47. Since March 2020, the Parties have negotiated in good faith on numerous policy and 17 procedure changes and have come to an agreement to address the findings of the investigation, as 18 discussed *supra*. The District has begun to make changes to its policies, procedures, and 19 practices, and is in the process of implementing several terms agreed upon by the Parties. 20 48. Plaintiff now seeks an order requiring the District to implement the agreed-upon 21 reforms and respectfully requests that the Court enter Judgment as set forth in the proposed 22 Stipulated Judgment. 23

# **CAUSES OF ACTION**

## FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

25 (Failure to Respond to Complaints of Retaliation and Discrimination and Provide a Legally **Compliant Response Process in Violation of Education Code sections 200 et seq. and 33315**) 26

- 49. Plaintiff realleges all paragraphs set forth above and incorporates them by reference
- 28 as though they were fully set forth in this cause of action.

50. The right to education is a fundamental right in California. (Serrano v. Priest (1971) 5 Cal.3d 584, 608-609, 616-617.)

3 51. Education Code section 220 prohibits discrimination on the basis of protected 4 characteristics, such as national origin, ethnicity, and immigration status, in state-funded 5 programs and activities and retaliation for advocacy to protect rights under any anti-6 discrimination statute or the right to access education. Schools districts are responsible for the 7 conduct of employees acting in the scope of their duties.

8

1

2

52. When a school district receives notice of an allegation of potential discrimination, 9 harassment, or retaliation, Education Code section 33315 requires the District to investigate and 10 provide a timely and effective response to end the discrimination, harassment, or retaliation, 11 prevent its recurrence, and remedy the effects using the Uniform Complaint Procedures.

12 The Uniform Complaint Procedures is the state's uniform process for investigating 53. 13 and resolving such reports and complaints and requires an independent investigation, an 14 opportunity for the complainant and respondent to present and respond to evidence, a written 15 decision of finding, and a right to appeal to the California Department of Education. (Ed. Code, § 16 33315; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, §§ 4610, et seq.)

17 54. The Uniform Complaint Procedures require schools to adopt policies and procedures 18 for investigation and resolution, provide annual notice of such procedures and the contact 19 information for the individual designated to oversee and coordinate compliance, ensure 20 employees are aware of their responsibilities for reporting complaints, provide non-discrimination 21 and retaliation law training, and encourage complainants to file in writing. School districts are 22 also required to establish a system for tracking receipt of oral and written complaints to assess for 23 trends and address compliance issues. (*Ibid.*)

24 55. Defendant has violated Education Code sections 200 et seq. and 33315 by failing to 25 provide a prompt, adequate, and procedurally compliant response to notice of discrimination and 26 retaliation by and his family and a school-site staff member, by subjecting and his 27 family and a school-site staff member to retaliation for protected activity, and by failing to have a 28 legally compliant discrimination and retaliation complaint investigation and resolution process.

1	56. Due to Defendant's violations of Education Code sections 200 et seq. and 33315, and	
2	their implementing regulations, injunctive relief and equitable relief, in the form of compensatory	
3	education service for <b>and</b> , are appropriate remedies.	
4	SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION	
5	(Student Record Confidentiality Breaches in Violation of	
6	Education Code sections 49076 & 234.7)	
7	57. Plaintiff realleges all paragraphs set forth above and incorporates them by reference	
8	as though they were fully set forth in this cause of action.	
9	58. School districts and their staff members are required to keep student records	
10	confidential, and it is generally unlawful to release information in a student's records to a third	
11	party without parental consent, a court order, or a subpoena. (Ed. Code, §§ 49076, subd. (a),	
12	234.7, subds. (f)(1), (g).)	
13	59. Because confidential students records were sent to a personal account and other	
14	student records were reported missing and not located, Defendant may have violated Education	
15	Code sections 49076, subd. (a), 234.7, subds. (f)(1), (g), and injunctive relief is an appropriate	
16	remedy.	
17	THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION	
18 10	(Failure to Appropriately Place, Track, and Evaluate Students in Independent Study in Violation of Education Code sections 51745-51747 and 51749.5.)	
19 20	60. Plaintiff realleges all paragraphs set forth above and incorporates them by reference	
20	as though they were fully set forth in this cause of action.	
21 22	61. A school district may not claim apportionments for independent study by pupils	
22	unless it has adopted policies that include: (1) the number of permissible missed assignments	
	before an evaluation is conducted and a written record of finding made to determine whether it is	
24	in the best interests of the pupil to remain in independent study; (2) the duration of the	
25 26	independent study agreement (which shall not be longer than a year); (3) a requirement that	
26 27	independent study is voluntary and a written agreement signed by the parent prior to	
27	commencement. (Ed. Code, §§ 51747, 51749.5.)	
28	12	

A school district must certify annually that independent study courses are of "the
 same rigor and educational quality as equivalent classroom-based courses." (Ed. Code, §
 51749.5, subd. (a)(4)(A).) Districts shall provide appropriate services to enable pupils to
 complete independent study successfully and to ensure the same access to services and resources
 in the pupil's school as are available to other pupils in that school. (Ed. Code, §§ 51745-51746.)

6 63. A student whose academic performance is not at grade level may participate in
7 independent study only if the program is able to provide appropriate support, such as
8 supplemental instruction, tutoring, counseling, and ongoing diagnostic assessments, to enable the
9 student to be successful. (Ed. Code, § 51745.)

- 10 64. The District is required to report the duration and the number of equivalent daily
  11 instructional minutes for each schoolday that a pupil is enrolled, number of equivalent total
  12 instructional minutes, and number of course credits for each course. (Ed. Code, § 51749.5.)
- 13 65. Because the District involuntarily placed one or more students, including **Determined**, in 14 independent study, provided independent study courses that were not of the same rigor and 15 quality as equivalent classroom-based courses, failed to provide appropriate services to one or 16 more students who were below grade level, including **state**, to allow successful completion of 17 independent study, did not conduct evaluations and make record of findings to determine whether 18 it was in the best interests of one or more students, including **set**, to remain in independent 19 study, and did not report required information about independent study, Defendant violated 20 Education Code sections 51745 through 51747 and 51749.5. Injunctive relief and equitable relief, 21 in the form of compensatory education service for **service**, are appropriate remedies.
- 22

27

## FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

# (Supervised Suspension Classroom in Violation of Education Code sections 48900.8, 48903, 48911, 48911.1, and 48915.5)

25 66. Plaintiff realleges all paragraphs set forth above and incorporates them by reference26 as though they were fully set forth in this cause of action.

- 67. Education Code section 48911.1 requires that students assigned to supervised
- 28 suspension classrooms be provided a credentialed teacher and access to counseling services.

1	68. School districts must identify in all appropriate official records and report to the
2	District's board each suspension of a pupil for commission of any Education Code offense. (Ed.
3	Code, §§ 48900.8, 48911, subd. (e).)
4	69. A suspension for one disciplinary incident may not be for more than five consecutive
5	schooldays, with limited exceptions. (Ed. Code, § 48911, subds. (a), (g).)
6	70. The total number of days for which a pupil may be suspended shall not exceed 20
7	schooldays in any school year. For students with a disability, prior to the student being removed
8	from class for more than 10 school days, a manifestation determination meeting shall be held to
9	determine whether the behavior was caused by disability or a failure to implement the student's
10	Individualized Education Program. (Ed. Code, §§ 48903, subd. (a), 48915.5, subds. (a), (b).)
11	71. Defendant has violated Education Code sections 48900.8, 48903, 48911, 48911.1,
12	and 48915.5, by failing to: (a) accurately record and track supervised suspensions; (b) provide a
13	credentialed teacher for a at least a half year during which supervised suspension was conducted;
14	and (c) provide access to counseling services, and by placing students, including
15	supervised suspension for longer than the statewide maximum.
16	72. Due to Defendant's violation of Education Code sections 48900.8, 48903, 48911,
17	48911.1 and 48915.5, injunctive relief and equitable relief, in the form of compensatory education
18	service for <b>a</b> , are appropriate remedies.
19	FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION
20	(Search and Seizure Absent Reasonable Suspicion in Violation of the Fourth Amendment of
21	the United States Constitution)
22	73. Plaintiff realleges all paragraphs set forth above and incorporates them by reference
23	as though they were fully set forth in this cause of action.
24	74. Under the Fourth Amendment, reasonable suspicion is required for school officials to
25	search students or their belongings. (New Jersey v. T.L.O. (1985) 469 U.S. 325, 333; In re
26	William G. (1985) 40 Cal.3d 550, 557.)
27	75. A random search by school officials, absent reasonable suspicion, is permissible
28	because of the "special needs" of public schools if: (1) the expectation of privacy is low; (2) the

1	degree of intrusion is minimal; and (3) the intrusion will fulfill an important governmental
2	interest that would otherwise be compromised by requiring suspicion (e.g., addressing a current
3	drug problem at the school). (See Veronia Sch. Dist. 47J v. Acton (1995) 515 U.S. 646, 653-660,
4	663.)
5	76. Because school administrators at the Middle School conducted searches absent
6	reasonable suspicion, under circumstances where no special need was demonstrated, and in the
7	absence of governing school district policy or regulation, the District may have violated students'
8	rights under the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution.
9	SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION
10	(Abrogation of the Rights of Students with Disabilities in Violation of Education Code
11	sections 56300 et seq.)
12	77. Plaintiff realleges all paragraphs set forth above and incorporates them by reference
13	as though they were fully set forth in this cause of action.
14	78. Government Code section 11135 prohibits discrimination based on disability in state-
15	funded programs and activities, including prohibiting unlawful denial of full and equal access to
16	the benefits of and unlawful discrimination under any such program or activity receiving funding
17	or financial assistance from the state. Government Code section 11135 incorporates requirements
18	that agencies that receive state funding provide students with disabilities and suspected
19	disabilities with procedural protections, reasonable accommodations, and modifications.
20	79. Education Code section 220 prohibits discrimination based on disability in state-
21	funded programs and activities and requires school districts to provide students with disabilities
22	and suspected disabilities with procedural protections, reasonable accommodations, and
23	modifications.
24	80. School districts are required to actively and systematically seek out all individuals
25	with special needs from birth to 21 years of age, and all children with disabilities shall be
26	identified, located, and assessed. (Ed. Code, §§ 56300-56302.) This systemic method of seeking
27	out students with potential disabilities is called "Child Find."
28	81. Education Code section 220 incorporates similar requirements to ensure non-

1

discrimination.

2 Once a student is referred for evaluation, a proposed evaluation plan shall be 82. 3 developed within 15 calendar days. (Ed. Code, § 56043, subd. (a).) The parent must consent to 4 the evaluation plan, and the pupil must be assessed in all areas of suspected disability, including 5 behavior health. (Ed. Code, §§ 56320, subd. (f), 56321.) If the parent disagrees with the 6 evaluation results, the parent has a right to obtain an educational assessment at public expense. 7 (Ed. Code, § 56329(b).) 8 83. Defendant has violated Government Code section 11135, Education Code sections 9 56300 et seq. and 220 by failing to actively and systematically seek out all individuals with 10 exceptional needs who reside in a school district and to identify, locate, and assess such students, 11 after receiving parental consent, in order to plan for an educational program that will meet their 12 unique needs. 13 84. Due to Defendant's violations of Government Code section 11135 and Education 14 Code sections 220 and 56300 et seq. and implementing regulations, injunctive relief is an 15 appropriate remedy. 16 SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION 17 (Involuntary Placement in a County Community Day School in Violation of Education Code section 1981) 18 19 85. Plaintiff realleges all paragraphs set forth above and incorporates them by reference 20 as though they were fully set forth in this cause of action. 21 86. Involuntary placement in a County Community Day School is prohibited, unless a 22 student is probation-referred, expelled or recommended for expulsion, or recommended by a 23 Student Attendance Review Board. A parent has a right to object to an involuntary transfer for 24 statutorily provided reasons, such as lack of transportation. A student may be transferred to a County Community Day School upon a parent's enrollment request with district approval and the 25 26 right to return. (Ed. Code, § 1981.) 27 87. Because Defendant involuntarily transferred one or more students to a County 28 Community Day School for reasons that are not permitted under state law and recorded one or

1	more involuntary transfers as "moved," Defendant may have violated Education Code section
2	1981.
3	88. Due to Defendant's violation of Education Code section 1981, injunctive relief is an
4	appropriate remedy.
5	PRAYER FOR RELIEF
6	WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully prays for the Court to enter judgment as follows:
7	89. For the Court to issue an order enjoining Defendant from engaging in the unlawful
8	practices challenged in this Complaint, requiring Defendant to implement the injunctive and
9	equitable relief provisions as set forth in the proposed Stipulated Judgment, and entering final
10	judgment;
11	90. For the Court to exercise, pursuant to the terms of the Stipulated Judgment,
12	continuing jurisdiction over this action to ensure that Defendant complies with the judgment as
13	set forth in the proposed Stipulated Judgment; and
14	91. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.
15	Dated: July 22, 2020 Respectfully Submitted,
16	Xavier Becerra
17	Attorney General of California MICHAEL L. NEWMAN
18	Senior Assistant Attorney General SARAH E. BELTON
19	Supervising Deputy Attorney General
20	
21	Lawry Fron
22	LAURA FAER Deputy Attorney General
23	Attorneys for the State of California
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	17