CASE CLOSURE SUMMARY REPORT

(This summary sheet must be used as a cover sheet for the hearing officer's decision whe example special education hearing and submitted to the Department of Education before billing.) Due processing the processing of the proces

Schools	Mr.
School Division	Name of Parents
	March 10, 2005
Name of Child	Date of Decision or Dismissal
Bradford A. King, Esq.	None
Counsel Representing LEA	Counsel Representing Parent/Child
Parent	LEA
Party Initiating Hearing	Prevailing Party
Hearing Officer's Orders and Outcome of Hearing	oring:
_	· '
Due Process matter dismissed du Hearing Officer to hear case.	ue to lack of jurisdiction of
parties of their appeal rights in writing. The writing.	g in accordance with regulations and have advised the ritten decision from this hearing is attached in which I y to submit an implementation plan to the parties, the lar days.
Richard E. Smith	Mymil
Printed Name of Hearing Officer	Signatura /

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION LOCAL DUE PROCESS HEARING

IN RE:

This day came the	Public Schools (and moved for a
dismissal of this due process proceeding.		

UPON CONSIDERATION WHEREOF, it appearing that the parent of the child, filed a due process request with on February 10, 2005. Duiring a pre-hearing telephone conference held February 28, 2005, the said parent confirmed that he had withdrawn the child from the on January 28, 2005 and enrolled him in an elementary shool in , Virginia.

The consistent weight of authority provides that when a child no longer resides in a school district, hearing officers lack the jurisdiction to hear due process complaints. In this case we have a child withdrawn from the and his residence changed from the

to __ s and enrollment in a public school.

The parent's request for due process challenged the child's IEP evaluation and alleges a failure to provide an appropriate education under the IDEA. The parent requests an independent evaluation of the child.

By the application of simple logic, the parent's due process request is moot because at the time it was made the child no longer resided in and no longer attended school there.

It is clear under Virginia law that school districts are reaponsible for educating the children residing within the school district, but have no responsibility to children living in other political subdivisions.

For the reasons cited, it is ORDERED that this due process matter is dismissed as I do not have jurisdiction to hear the matter.

3/10/05

ENTER:

Hearing Officer

Distribution:

Bradford A. King, Esquire

Virginia Department of Education Frederick A. Hodnett, Jr., Supreme Court of Virginia