

No. 04-698

---

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

BRIAN SCHAFFER, A MINOR, BY HIS PARENTS AND NEXT  
FRIENDS, JOCELYN AND MARTIN SCHAFFER, *et al.*,  
*Petitioner,*

v.

JERRY WEAST, SUPERINTENDENT,  
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS, *et al.*,  
*Respondent.*

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF  
APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

**BRIEF OF *AMICI CURIAE***

**COUNCIL OF PARENT ATTORNEYS AND ADVOCATES;  
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PROTECTION AND ADVOCACY  
SYSTEMS; AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF PEOPLE WITH  
DISABILITIES; NATIONAL CHILDREN'S LAW NETWORK;  
EDUCATION LAW CENTER OF NEW JERSEY; EDUCATION  
LAW CENTER OF PENNSYLVANIA; ALEXANDER GRAHAM  
BELL ASSOCIATION FOR THE DEAF AND HARD OF  
HEARING; BAZELON CENTER FOR MENTAL HEALTH LAW;  
CENTER FOR LAW AND EDUCATION; UNIVERSITY OF  
RICHMOND'S SCHOOL OF LAW DISABILITY LAW CLINIC;  
DISABILITY RIGHTS EDUCATION AND DEFENSE FUND, INC.;  
TASH, INC.; WESTERN LAW CENTER FOR DISABILITY  
RIGHTS SUPPORTING PETITIONERS.**

ANKUR J. GOEL  
*Counsel of Record*  
M. MILLER BAKER  
KARLA L. PALMER  
ERIK C. BAPTIST

MCDERMOTT WILL &  
EMERY LLP  
600 13th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 756-8000

*Counsel for Amici Curiae*

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**INTERESTS OF AMICI..... 1**

**SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT ..... 6**

**ARGUMENT..... 8**

**I. PLACING THE BURDEN OF PROOF ON THE SCHOOL DISTRICT WOULD BEST SERVE CONGRESS’ AFFIRMATIVE MANDATE THAT ALL CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES RECEIVE A FREE APPROPRIATE PUBLIC EDUCATION ..... 10**

**II. THE SCHOOL DISTRICT STANDS IN A BETTER POSITION TO BEAR THE BURDEN OF PROOF, AND PLACING THE BURDEN ON PARENTS RISKS DENYING CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES AN APPROPRIATE EDUCATION..... 13**

**A. Many Parents Proceed Pro Se And Are Unfamiliar With The Implications Of Bearing The Burden Of Proof ..... 14**

**B. Parents Are Not Entitled Under IDEA To Pre-Hearing Discovery That Would Allow Them To Meet The Burden Of Proof ..... 17**

**1. Parents have no way of learning the school’s contentions..... 17**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
(continued)

2.	<b>Parents do not know, and have no right under IDEA to discover, details about a proposed placement.....</b>	<b>18</b>
C.	<b>Parents Of Children With Disabilities Are Disproportionately Poorer And Significantly Less Educated.....</b>	<b>20</b>
D.	<b>The School District Developed The Proposal And Should Already Have The Information Needed To Satisfy The Burden Of Proof .....</b>	<b>21</b>
E.	<b>The School District Employs Professionals Who Can Serve As Witnesses .....</b>	<b>22</b>
F.	<b>The Procedural Protections The Fourth Circuit Cited Do Not Warrant Placing The Burden Of Proof On Parents.....</b>	<b>22</b>
1.	<b>The procedural protections do not alter the fact that the school district stands in a better position to meet the burden of proof.....</b>	<b>23</b>

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
(continued)

<b>2. Assigning the burden of proof to the school district implements Congress' objective in enacting procedural protections and promotes parent participation.....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>30</b>

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**CASES**

*Alaska Dept. of Env'tl. Conservation v. EPA*, 540 U.S. 461 (2004)..... 9

*Bd. of Educ. of the Hendrick Hudson C.S.C. v. Rowley*, 458 U.S. 176 (1982)..... 10, 11, 12, 21

*Briere v. Fair Haven Grade Sch. Dist.*, 948 F. Supp. 1242 (D. Vt. 1996) ..... 27

*Cedar Rapids Cmty. Sch. Dist. v. Garret F.*, 526 U.S. 66 (1999)..... 20

*County Sch. Bd. of Henrico County v. Z.P.*, 399 F.3d 298 (4th Cir. 2005)..... 20

*Dibuo v. Bd. of Educ.*, 309 F.3d 184 (4th Cir. 2002) ..... 27

*Dir. v. Greenwich Collieries*, 512 U.S. 267 (1994) ..... 9, 13

*Hanson v. Smith*, 212 F. Supp. 2d 474 (D. Md. 2002)..... 18

*Int'l Bd. of Teamsters v. United States*, 431 U.S. 324 (1977) ..... 13

*Keyes v. Sch. Dist. No. 1*, 413 U.S. 189 (1973) ..... 9

*M.C. v. Cent. Reg'l Sch. Dist.*, 81 F.3d 389 (3d Cir. 1996)..... 10

*Mills v. Bd. of Educ.*, 348 F. Supp. 866 (D.D.C. 1972)..... 6

*Olmstead v. L.C.*, 527 U.S. 581 (1999) ..... 11

*Sch. Comm. of the Town of Burlington v. Dept. of Educ. of Massachusetts*, 471 U.S. 359 (1985)..... 23, 28

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**  
(continued)

*Shapiro v. Paradise Valley Unified Sch. Dist.*, 317  
F.3d 1072 (9th Cir. 2003)..... 27

*Sony Corp. v. Universal City Studios, Inc.*, 464 U.S.  
417 (1984)..... 9

*United Sav. Assoc. v. Timbers of Inwood Forest  
Assocs., Ltd.*, 484 U.S. 365 (1988)..... 28

*United States v. Bacto-Unidisk*, 394 U.S. 784 (1969)..... 9, 13

*United States v. Denver & R.G. R.R. Co.*, 191 U.S. 84  
(1903) ..... 13

*United States v. N.Y., N.H. & H.R. Co.*, 355 U.S. 253  
(1957) ..... 13

*Weyrick v. New Albany-Floyd County Consol. Sch.  
Corp.*, No. 4:03-cv-0095, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS  
26435 (S.D. Ind. 2004)..... 11

*XXXX XXXX v. Baltimore City Pub. Sch.*, Order,  
OAH No.: MSDE-CITY-OT-200200192, Md.  
Office of Admin. Hearings (June 26, 2002) ..... 3, 15

**STATUTES**

20 U.S.C. § 1400(c)(1) ..... 12

20 U.S.C. § 1400(d)(1) (2005)..... 10

20 U.S.C. § 1412(a)(1) ..... 2, 10, 12

20 U.S.C. § 1412(a)(10)(A)(ii) ..... 10

20 U.S.C. § 1412(a)(11) ..... 11

