

Melissa Rueschhoff, Esq.  
934 Hartinger St.  
Colorado Springs, CO 80910  
(719) 785-9150  
mrueschhoff@siglawpartners.com  
State Bar Number: 24210

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA  
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF PIMA

DERRALL PEACH and DENISE  
PEACH, Individually and on behalf of  
their minor child, A.P.,  
  
and ASDB Families,  
  
ANDREA LOPEZ and MIKE RANEY,  
individually and on behalf of their  
minor children, A.R and L.R.,  
  
REBEKAH TRIVITT and JAMES  
TRIVITT, individually and on behalf of  
their minor children, J.T. and B.T.,  
  
JESSICA MENDOZA, individually and  
on behalf of her minor child, L.M.,  
  
RON SISCO and MARISELA SISCO,  
individually and on behalf of their  
minor child, I.S.,  
  
SIERRA VINSON, individually and on  
behalf of her minor child, E.V.,  
  
JAVIER DAVILA and MARIA  
DAVILA, individually and on behalf of  
their minor child, M.O.,  
  
ALBERTO AHUMADA and LYZA  
AHUMADA, individually and on  
behalf of their minor child, M.S.,

Case No.:

---

**COMPLAINT FOR**  
**DECLARATORY AND**  
**INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**  
**NATURE OF THE ACTION**

BEATA TARASIUK, individually and  
on behalf of her minor child K.K,  
  
ELIZABETH LOMELI, individually  
and on behalf of her minor child E.L.,  
  
and JOSIE ENCINAS, individually and  
on behalf of his minor child J.L.,

Parents and Guardians of Students  
Enrolled at the Arizona School for the  
Deaf and the Blind,

Plaintiff(s)

vs.

ARIZONA STATE SCHOOLS FOR  
THE DEAF AND THE BLIND;

THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF  
THE ARIZONA STATE SCHOOLS  
FOR THE DEAF AND THE BLIND;

ANNETTE REICHMAN, in her official  
capacity as Superintendent of the  
Arizona State Schools for the Deaf and  
the Blind,

Defendant(s).

---

1. This is an action for **declaratory and injunctive relief** to prevent Defendants from unlawfully closing, dismantling, or materially curtailing programs serving blind and visually impaired students at the Arizona School for the Deaf and the Blind (“ASDB”), and from displacing students without compliance with mandatory state and federal law.

2. Plaintiffs seek emergency relief to preserve the status quo and prevent **irreparable harm** to students with disabilities while the Court adjudicates Defendants' compliance with governing law.

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

3. This Court has jurisdiction under Article VI, § 14 of the Arizona Constitution and A.R.S. § 12-123.

4. Venue is proper in Pima County because ASDB operates facilities in this County and the actions challenged herein will occur here.

### **PARTIES**

5. Plaintiffs are parents and legal guardians of minor children enrolled at ASDB, including students who are blind or visually impaired and students who are deaf or hard of hearing.

6. Defendant Arizona State Schools for the Deaf and the Blind is a state educational institution and local education agency ("**LEA**") responsible for providing a Free Appropriate Public Education ("**FAPE**") to eligible students.

7. Defendant **Annette Reichman** ("**Reichman**") is the Superintendent of ASDB and is sued in her official capacity.

8. Defendant **Board of Directors of ASDB** ("**ASBD Board**") is the governing body responsible for approving school closures, programmatic changes, and facilities decisions affecting ASDB students.

## **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

9. ASDB is statutorily and constitutionally required to educate both Deaf/Hard-of-Hearing students and Blind/Visually Impaired students, and to do so through individualized, lawful procedures.

10. Plaintiffs' children rely on specialized instruction, trained staff, accessible communication environments, and continuity of services to access education and avoid regression.

11. In or around January 2026, Superintendent Annette Reichman and ASDB leadership began advancing plans to close, dismantle, or materially curtail programs serving blind and visually impaired students, while maintaining or prioritizing programming for deaf and hard-of-hearing students.

12. Plaintiffs were informed that blind and visually impaired students may be displaced to local school districts that lack the capacity to provide comparable specialized services or accessible educational environments.

13. Defendants provided inadequate, untimely, and in some instances inaccessible notice of the proposed actions and scheduled an imminent Board vote.

14. Defendants failed to comply with mandatory statutory prerequisites governing school closure and facilities changes, including A.R.S. § 15-341, which requires notice, a public hearing, a waiting period before any vote, and written approval from the School Facilities Oversight Board before any action that would reduce pupil square footage.

15. Defendants further failed to conduct individualized IEP-based placement determinations or consider less restrictive alternatives, as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, and Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

16. Superintendent Reichman has publicly asserted that there are no elementary-age visually impaired students enrolled at ASDB, despite the enrollment of at least one visually impaired elementary-age student, raising serious concerns regarding the accuracy of enrollment data relied upon to justify the proposed actions.

17. Plaintiffs report that referrals and admissions for blind and visually impaired students have been delayed or denied, resulting in artificially depressed enrollment figures.

18. If Defendants proceed, students will suffer immediate and irreparable harm, including disruption of IEP-mandated services, loss of accessible educational environments, educational regression, and emotional distress, harms that cannot be remedied by monetary damages.

**CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**  
**COUNT I – Declaratory Relief (A.R.S. § 12-1831 et seq.)**

19. An actual and justiciable controversy exists regarding Defendants' authority to proceed with the proposed closure or functional closure of ASDB programs for blind and visually impaired students.

20. Plaintiffs seek a declaration that Defendants' contemplated actions violate A.R.S. § 15-341, federal disability-rights law, and Arizona's Open Meeting Law, and are therefore unlawful and ultra vires.

**COUNT II – Injunctive Relief**

21. Defendants' actions threaten immediate and irreparable harm to Plaintiffs and their children.

22. Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law.

23. Absent injunctive relief, Defendants will irreversibly alter students' educational placements and facilities before lawful process or judicial review can occur.

[CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE]

### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court:

- A. Declare Defendants' contemplated actions unlawful and beyond their statutory authority;
- B. Issue a **Temporary Restraining Order** and **Preliminary Injunction** enjoining Defendants from proceeding with any vote or action to close, consolidate, relocate, or dismantle ASDB programs serving blind or visually impaired students unless and until Defendants fully comply with applicable state and federal law;
- C. Enjoin Defendants from taking any action that would reduce pupil square footage without prior written approval from the School Facilities Oversight Board;
- D. Award Plaintiffs their reasonable attorneys' fees and costs as permitted by law; and
- E. Grant such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Signature Law Partners**

By: /s/Melissa Rueschhoff

**Melissa Rueschhoff, Esq.**

Attorney for Plaintiffs

Attorney Bar No. 24210

Signature Law Partners, PLLC

934 Hartinger St.

Colorado Springs, CO 80916

Tel: (719) 785-9150

Email: [mrueschhoff@siglawpartners.com](mailto:mrueschhoff@siglawpartners.com)