STATE OF CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Student v. Ridgefield Board of Education

Appearing on behalf of the Student:	Attorney Lawrence Berliner Law Office of Lawrence Berliner, LLC 1720 Post Road East, Suite 214-E Westport, CT 06680
Appearing on behalf of the Board:	Attorney Christopher Tracey Shipman & Goodwin, LLP One Constitution Plaza Hartford, CT 06103-1919
Appearing before:	Attorney Brette H. Fitton, Hearing Officer

FINAL DECISION AND ORDER

ISSUES:

- 1. Did the District deny Student a free appropriate public education ("FAPE") during the 2015-2016 school year?
- 2. Did the District deny Student a FAPE during the extended school year ("ESY") in the summer of 2016?
- 3. Did the District deny Student a FAPE during the 2016-2017 school year?
- 4. Did the District deny Student a FAPE during the ESY occurring in the summer of 2017?
- 5. Was the Individualized Education Program developed for the 2017-2018 school year appropriate? If the IEP for 2017-2018 is not appropriate, does the Hyde School offer an appropriate program and should Parents be reimbursed for the costs of tuition and related expenses for Student's enrollment for the 2017-2018 school year?
- 6. Are Parents entitled to reimbursement for an independent educational evaluation completed by Dr. Ilana Karpenos?
- 7. Is compensatory education an appropriate remedy?
- 8. Did the District deny Student's right to a FAPE under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation a FAPE during the 2015-2016, 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 school years and during the summer of 2017?

PROCEDURAL HISTORY AND SUMMARY:

On June 29, 2017, the Ridgefield Board of Education received a special education due process hearing request filed by Attorney for the Parents. On July 12, 2017, a prehearing conference was held and the deadline for mailing the final decision and order was established as September 12, 2017. The parties indicated that the matter had settled at a resolution conference that was held prior to the prehearing conference. On August 2, 2017, the Attorney for the Parents withdrew the request for hearing with prejudice.

FINAL DECISION AND ORDER:

In light of the above facts, the case is dismissed.