

**FINAL DECISION**

Sent via email [REDACTED] Certified Mail [REDACTED]

September 4, 2025

[REDACTED]

RE: Final Decision

Dear [REDACTED]

On **July 16th**, the proposed decision of the hearing officer regarding the eligibility of [REDACTED] to receive services of the Department of Developmental Services was sent to you and all parties. Parties had ten (10) business days from receipt of the proposed decision to submit comments in support or opposition. Comments were not submitted by the petitioner. No comments were submitted on behalf of DDS.

After reviewing the proposed decision, the record, including exhibits submitted at the hearing, I agree with the hearing officer, adopt the Proposed Decision as the Final Decision, and find that [REDACTED] is ineligible for services of the Department of Developmental Services pursuant to Connecticut General Statute section 1-1g.

If you do not agree with this decision, you have the right, in accordance with Section 4-183 of the Connecticut General Statutes, to appeal to the Superior Court. Such an appeal must be submitted within forty-five (45) days of the mailing of this final decision.



**Elisa F. Velardo**  
Deputy Commissioner  
Designee of Jordan A. Scheff  
Commissioner

Enclosures

cc: Attorney Wendy Mongillo, Hearing Officer  
Kathleen Murphy, Ph.D., Director, Eligibility Unit  
Margret Rudin, Ph.D., Psychologist Eligibility Unit  
Marjorie O. Wakeman, Esq., Director, Legal & Government Affairs

STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENTAL SERVICES  
PROPOSED MEMORANDUM OF DECISION  
ELIGIBILITY HEARING

IN RE: [REDACTED]

June 16, 2025

**INTRODUCTION:**

On June 16, 2025, 2025 at 10:00 a.m. a hearing was held at the Department of Developmental Services, 460 Capitol Avenue in Hartford, Connecticut and remotely, via Microsoft Teams, to determine the eligibility of [REDACTED] for services from the Department of Developmental Services (DDS) pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes Section 1-1g. The request for hearing was filed on February 11, 2025 by [REDACTED] who is the sister and POA of the Applicant.

**Name of Attendees:**

[REDACTED]	Applicant's Sister/ POA
[REDACTED]	Applicant
[REDACTED]	Applicant's sister
Margaret Rudin, PhD	DDS Psychologist Eligibility Unit

**Statement of Issues**

Is [REDACTED] eligible for services from the Department of Developmental Services?

**Exhibits Entered Into Evidence**

The following documents were presented by the parties and admitted into evidence as full exhibits by the undersigned hearing officer:

HO-1	Denial of Eligibility Dated 1/29/2025
HO-2	Request for Hearing Dated 2/11/2025
HO-3	Notice of Hearing Dated 2/24/2025
DDS-1	DDS Eligibility Application Dated 12/27/2024
DDS-2	Denial Letter 1/29/2025
DDS-3	Second Review by Dr. Margaret Rudin, Ph.D. 11/26/2024
DDS-4	Letter Dated 10/30/1996
DDS-5	Senior Grades Dated [REDACTED]
DDS-6	Class rank dated [REDACTED]
DDS-7	Computer Competency
DDS-8	Fax Request dated 1/13/2003
P-1	Evaluation Dated 2/03/2025

**Finding of Facts:**

The exhibits entered into evidence, along with sworn testimony at the hearing result in the following findings:

1. [REDACTED] is a resident of the State of Connecticut as he resides in the Town/ City of [REDACTED], Connecticut
2. At the time of the hearing, [REDACTED], born [REDACTED] was [REDACTED] years old.
3. Exhibits demonstrated that the Applicant was involved in Easter Seals when she was younger;
4. The Applicant attended [REDACTED] School "It appears as if some minimum requirements were met for graduation". (Testimony M Rudin, DDS Exhibits 5-8)
5. Records appear to indicate that the Applicant was a special education student.

6. That "under the current status, she has outpatient behavioral health services at the clinic in [REDACTED] she's got a therapist and a psychiatrist". (Testimony M. Rudin Exhibit P1)
7. That "we do not have very many records on [REDACTED] before she was 18...." (Testimony , [REDACTED])
8. "DDS reviewed the paperwork that has been submitted. We combed through as much as we could of the information for CGS 1-1g" (testimony M. Rudin)

**Definition of Intellectual Disability:**

According to Connecticut General Statutes Section 1-1g, in order to be eligible for supports or services from the Department of Developmental Services for an intellectual disability, an individual must demonstrate significant limitations in intellectual functioning and deficits in adaptive behavior that originated **during** the developmental period before eighteen years of age (emphasis added).

**Discussion:**

While the applicant may require assistance, guidance and support there is insufficient documentation in the records to establish that she is intellectually disabled pursuant to Connecticut State Statutes. Unfortunately, there is not enough information provided to demonstrate that her deficits in intellectual functioning or adaptive behaviors were significant enough to fall within the intellectually disabled range during her developmental period. As such the statutory requirements of the Connecticut General Statute Section 1-1g have not been satisfied in the present case.

**Conclusion:**

The Applicant is not eligible for services from the Department of Developmental Services based on intellectual disabilities, as she does not meet the criteria for services as defined in Connecticut General Statute Section 1-1g. The Applicant, however, may be eligible for services/ benefits through other Federal and State agencies and programs.

This decision shall be submitted to all parties and the Commissioner. The parties may submit written comments in support or opposition to this proposed decision within ten days of receipt hereof.

Respectfully Submitted

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Wendy Mongillo', with a long, sweeping vertical stroke extending upwards from the end of the signature.

Hearing Officer

Wendy Mongillo