#### CASE CLOSURE SUMMARY REPORT

(This summary sheet must be used as a cover sheet for the hearing officer's decision at the special education hearing and submitted to the Department of Education before illing.)

PUBLIC SCHOOLS	Ms. 22.22.22 02
School Division	Name of Parents
	October 3,
Name of Child	Date of Decision or Dismissal
Ed.D.	Ms. Pro=se
Counsel Representing LEA	Counsel Representing Parent/Child
	Public Schools
Party Initiating Hearing	Prevailing Party
Hearing Officer's Determination of Issue(s):	*

s misconduct (possession of marijuana on school grounds) was NOT a Manifestation of Disabilities.

Hearing Officer's Orders and Outcome of Hearing:

The expulsion of

School was in accordance with PS Regulation 2610.13, Section II and was a proper determination and is upheld.

This certifies that I have completed this hearing in accordance with regulations and have advised the parties of their appeal rights in writing. The written decision from this hearing is attached in which I have also advised the LEA of its responsibility to submit an implementation plan to the parties, the hearing officer, and the SEA within 45 calendar days.

Printed Name of Hearing Officer

# PUBLIC SCHOOLS (Due Process Proceeding)

In re:

## FINAL ORDER OF HEARING OFFICER,

24	
This Due Process Hearing was conducted on September 9th and	
Oth, at the	
irginia.	
, Ed.D, coordinator, Monitoring and Compliance,	
n behalf of Public Schools called the following witnesses	
o testify, namely, of — of —	
Hearing Officer for the Schoold Board,	
PS psychologist, Special Education	
earling disability teacher, Police, and	
, Special Education Department Chairman at High	
chool.	
Ms. mother of acting pro se. called	d
the following witnesses, namely,, Clerk ofCounty	
school Board, Principal,	
, Ph.D., psychologist, and her , .	
Dr. also offered into evidence 44 documents, and Ms.	P,
10 documents, all of which were admitted into evidence in this proceedi	ng
The transcript of this Hearing consisted of a total of 667 pages.	

## FINDINGS OF FACT

ion of marijuana on school grounds was not a manifestation of

symptoms of ADHD.

ing disabilities or

Ph.D., a clinical psychologist, called as a witness by Ms. Conducted a 5½ hour psychological evaluation of testified that although students with ADHD tend to be impulsive and may not anticipate the consequences of their actions, she could not assert that simisconduct was a manifestation of learning disabilities or ADHD, only that ADHD may have played some role in actions.

The preponderance and weight of all of the evidence clearly reflects that knew right from wrong. Is a likable and personable young. However, by concealing the marijuana in the pocket of shorts worn under outer pants it was obvious that by concealing the marijuana that knew the consequences of misconduct. There was no credible evidence presented that smisconduct was a manifestation of disabilities.

### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Based on my stated Findings of Fact I hereby rule in favor of

Public Schools. The weight and preponderence of ths

evidence is too overwhelming to rule otherwise.

Accordingly, I uphold the Manifestation Determination Review conducted January 27, conducted by the IEP committee and the decision of the School Board of August 25, that spossession of marijuana on school grounds was not a manifestation of disabilities and that expulsion was proper. The Issue of placement, therefore, is not a matter for determination by me.

This Decision is final and binding on all parties unless it is appealed by either party within one year from the date of issuance hereof.

The appeal may be filed in a Virginia Circuit Court or a United States

District Court.

Date of Issuance: October 3,

Respectfully submitted:

Hearing Officer

Copies mailed to:

Ms. Ed.D., PS
Virginia Department of Education