



## II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On February 28, 2022, Student, Parent, ("Petitioner" or "Student") filed a Complaint with the Texas Education Agency ("TEA") against Hooks Independent School District ("Respondent" or "District"), requesting an impartial Due Process Hearing, pursuant to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 ("IDEA"). On February 28, 2022, TEA assigned(tt)nix8(ni)fte(uo)16.7 (t)(ri)9.3 (c)40.-9 4.35 en-7.3 (D00)171.7 aoouof

hearing made it difficult for Petitioner's \*\*\* non-attorney representative to prosecute/defend Petitioner's case; that the non-attorney representative was not prepared to respond to the perceived allowance of certain historical information; and that hiring a special education attorney would avail Petitioner of a fair proceeding. Respondent objected to this filing. Over the Respondent's objection, the undersigned found good cause for granting the continuance. Respondent requested that at the very least, the Parties convene the hearing prior to the end of the fall semester.

On November 15, 2022, the undersigned requested the Parties' availability for the convening of the hearing. Following a status follow-up request by the undersigned, Petitioner confirmed that Petitioner was unable to hire counsel due to financial constraints and would proceed with the hearing using Petitioner's non-attorney representative. On November 30, 2022, the Parties agreed to the following schedule. the Disclosure Deadline: December 7, 2022; the Due Process Hearing: December 15, 2022; and the Decision Deadline: December 29, 2022.

Both Parties made their Disclosures timely.

The SEHO convened a ZOOM Due Process Hearing on December 15, 2022. The Parties' Exhibits were admitted; the Parties called a total of five

8.	Petitioner's email contained no request for a personal or email response from the District. The District
	did not respond to the email in light of its content addressing possible legal action and excluding any
	response or request for evaluation or other remedies [T.1.50.18; P.I.1-4]

9.	Respondent has an on-going affirmative duty to locate, evaluate, and identify all children with disabilities residi10 0 0 10 334.6 4.233 Td(a40 0 0 10 3343 (s)3343 (s)3343 (s)3343 (s)3df11.4 (e,)-11.3 (and)]TJ0 Tw identi-67aidd67aiddf-F2.171(tb)-12.3 (t)F0112L667 ADD)-Di(s).1128(12)61(2)0122(12)61(2)0122(12)61(2)0122(12)61(2)0122(12)61(2)0122(12)61(2)0122(12)61(2)0122(12)61(2)0122(12)61(2)0122(12)61(2)0122(12)61(2)0122(12)61(2)0122(12)61(2)0122(12)61(2)0122(12)61(2)0122(12)61(2)0122(12)61(2)012(12)61(				
	ngona ο ασωνών ακου περικτρομ περουμεταμον κουσμορμετισμότε.υσν (πομετικρομέμυ μέν) το να (παν)-σ Υ(ΠΕΓΙΙ)				

- 19. Respondent complied with its Child Find obligations when it completed Petitioner's FIE on September \*\*\*, 2022 [R.10 & 14].
- 20. Petitioner's ARDC meet on October \*\*\*, 2022, to review the FIE. The ARDC determined that at this time, Petitioner does not meet the qualifications as a student with a Specific Learning Disability [R.13.001]. Student qualified under the Other Health Impairment ("OHI") category based upon Student's \*\*\* [R.13.001]. Student's ARDC developed goals under OT, Reading, and Math, as well as Accommodations because of the challenges of Student's \*\*\* [R.8.032]. Variations in Student's \*\*\* cause challenges with staying on task and maintaining focus. The FIE and ARDC determined that although Student had some characteristics of dyslexia, the assessor could not rule out the exclusionary factors regarding Petitioner's lack of educational opportunity and exposure since Student's withdrawal [R.8.032].

## A. CHILD FIND

In complying with their FAPE responsibilities, it is incumbent that states and local school districts locate and identify students with disabilities who are in na*6 Tm()T or061 Tw -5 TyHe.3 (oc)-13 (e i)-2.7 (al)-7 ctocc	.5.10