UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

CIVIL ACTION NO. 09-

DRACUT SCHOOL COMMITTEE, Plaintiff

٧.

BUREAU OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
APPEALS OF THE
MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT
OF ELEMENTARY AND
SECONDARY EDUCATION,
MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT
OF ELEMENTARY AND
SECONDARY EDUCATION,
P.A. AND C.A.
Defendants



COMPLAINT FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW OF FINAL DECISION OF STATE ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY

Jurisdiction

1. This is a complaint for judicial review of a final Decision of the Defendant Bureau of Special Education Appeals of the Massachusetts Department of Education, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. §1415(i)(2) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

The Parties

2. Plaintiff is the Dracut School Committee, a body politic and corporate as established under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, with a usual place of business located at 2063 Lakeville Avenue, Dracut, Massachusetts (hereinafter "Dracut").

- 3. Defendant Bureau of Special Education Appeals of the Massachusetts

 Department of Elementary and Secondary Education has a usual place of business at 75

 Pleasant Street, Malden, Massachusetts.
- 4. Defendant Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary
 Education has a usual place of business at 75 Pleasant Street, Malden, Massachusetts.
- 5. Defendant, C.A. , resides in Dracut, Massachusetts (hereinafter "Student").
- 6. Defendant, P.A., resides in Dracut, Massachusets (hereinafter "Parent") and is the parent of C.A.

Cause of Action

- 7. The Student, nineteen (19) years old, attended Dracut High School from the fall of 2004, his freshman year, through June of 2008, his senior year.
- 8. On or about January 2006, Dracut found the student eligible to begin receiving special education and related services. Prior to that time, the Student was eligible for and received an accommodation plan pursuant to Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act.
- 9. The Student's principal diagnosis is Asperger's Syndrome. The Student has also been diagnosed with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder and an anxiety disorder.
- 10. While the Student attended Dracut High School, the Student had three Individual Education Plans (IEPs). Each IEP included a transition plan.
- While Student attended Dracut High School, the Student took collegepreparatory classes, including a college preparatory level science class which utilized pre-

college text, and received a grade of A plus. The Student was observed to function at a very high level, was engaged, and worked on-task.

- 12. While Student attended Dracut High School, he was a member of the track team during his junior and senior years. Through participation on the track team, the Student created a social group with whom he socialized during school. Dracut's staff observed him to appropriately interact with peers and staff. The Student's track teammates awarded the Student the "Team Spirit" Award at the end of his junior year. He received the Fran Kelley Award in his senior year, an honor given to a student whose participation in track has helped overcome obstacles.
- During the Student's senior year at Dracut High School, he successfully participated in a gym mentoring program four (4) times per week for one (1) semester. Student was responsible for leading stretching exercises, organizing equipment, explaining the rules, and acting as referee.
- 14. During the Student's senior year at Dracut High School, Dracut facilitated the Student's employment at a private credit union located within Dracut High School for fifty (50) minutes three times per week, and at times an additional ninety (90) minutes per week. Student successfully learned to make deposits and withdrawals for bank customers. He was observed to work well with others, including members of the public who utilized the bank.
- 15. During the Student's senior year at Dracut High School, he also participated in a technology internship for ninety (90) minutes, one time per week. The internship consisted of meeting with Dracut's technology coordinator, assessing, troubleshooting, and repairing computers by replacing or installing software or hardware.

Student was noted to follow directions, be polite, and demonstrate excellent behavior while interacting with adults.

- 16. The Student received three scholarship awards in 2008, which he was awarded at Dracut High School's "Pride Night."
- 17. During the time the Student attended Dracut High School, he consistently informed Dracut staff that his primary focus regarding transition planning was to attend college and work with computers.
- 18. By June of 2008, the Student had completed all state and local graduation requirements. Dracut staff agreed that the Student was prepared to leave Dracut High School and attend college.
- 19. The Student has continued his education at Middlesex Community

 College during the 2008-2009 school year. He takes public transportation to college and attends classes twice per week.
- 20. On or about May 29, 2008 the parent filed a Request for Hearing with the Bureau of Special Education Appeals of the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education seeking a finding that Dracut had failed to provide appropriate transition services, and that Dracut must continue to provide transition services to the student as well as compensatory transition services.
- 21. The Parent also contested Dracut's decision to graduate the Student in June of 2008 and sought an emergency "stay-put" Order allowing the Student to participate in graduation ceremonies without accepting his diploma. On June 6, 2008, the hearing officer ruled that the Student would be allowed to participate in graduation exercises, decline his diploma, and retain his substantive and procedural rights to a free

and appropriate public education until resolution of the Parent's Request for Hearing.

The hearing officer further found that the Student's last agreed upon educational program and placement (i.e. "stay-put" placement) was the Student's then-current IEP.

- 22. On or about December 11, 2008, January 22, 2009, and February 2, 2009 the defendant, the Bureau of Special Education Appeals of the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, conducted an administrative due process hearing relative to the defendant Parent's Request for Hearing.
- 23. At the hearing, testimony regarding the Student's progress and success at Dracut High School was undisputed, including that the Student had achieved all local and state requirements for graduation.
- Abele, a speech and language pathologist who privately evaluated the Student in January of 2005 and March of 2007 for the purpose of assessing the Student's pragmatic language abilities. Ms. Abele testified that the Student had pragmatic language deficits and that she had recommended direct services to the Student's IEP team, however the IEP team declined to adopt her recommendations. Dracut presented testimony that the Student's IEP team declined to adopt Ms. Abele's recommendations because the Dracut staff observed the Student to be successful in school and concluded that direct pragmatic language services were not needed.
- 25. At hearing, the Student/Parent also presented testimony from a private consultant, Michele Mayer, who conducted a "readiness-to-graduate" assessment of the Student in October of 2008. Ms. Mayer testified as to her opinion that the Student was not prepared to graduate from high school and would benefit from additional services in

order to be ready to graduate. She also recommended additional testing of the Student's social skills.

- Appeals of the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education issued a Decision, wherein the defendant Bureau of Special Education Appeals of the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education found that "[i]t is undisputed that Student has met all of Dracut's and Massachusetts' requirements for graduation from high school." (See Decision, attached hereto as Exhibit 1, at 39). The hearing officer further stated that, "Dracut may (and should) grant the Student his high school diploma at this time." *Id.* at 40.
- 27. Despite the hearing officer's finding that the Student had met all local and state requirements for graduation and that Dracut may and should graduate the Student from high school, the hearing officer ordered that "Dracut shall provide student with extended special education eligibility for purposes of receiving two years of additional transition services and (during the same time period) two years of services for older students under Massachusetts special education regulations." *Id.* at 41.
- 28. The hearing officer ordered Dracut to convene an IEP team meeting for purposes of developing a new transition plan within thirty (30) days of the date of Decision, with services under the new transition plan and services for older students to commence within sixty (60) days of the date of the Decision and to continue for two (2) years thereafter. *Id.* at 41.
- 29. The hearing officer further ordered Dracut to provide transition services and services for older children consistent with the Decision including: (1) pragmatic

language instruction; (2) development of organizational skills; (3) vocational training that includes placement and support within three or four worksites in the community; (3) travel instruction; (4) and a comprehensive social skills assessment. *Id.* at 41.

- 30. Finally, the hearing officer ordered Dracut to hire and compensate the student/parent's expert witnesses, Mary Elsa Abele and Michele Mayer, for sufficient consultation time so that they may (1) provide consultation to Dracut to assist in the development of the transition plan that complies with the Decision, (2) advise Dracut during the two-year period of extended eligibility regarding the need for any modifications to Dracut's proposed transition plan, and (3) advise Dracut regarding the appropriate implementation of its transition plan. In the event that Ms. Abele and Ms. Mayer are not able to provide the consultation, then the hearing officer ordered Dracut to retain substitute consultants who are recommended by Ms. Abele or Ms. Mayer. *Id.* at 42.
- 31. The Plaintiff, Dracut School Committee, is aggrieved by the Defendant Bureau of Special Education Appeals of the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's Decision of March 13, 2009, in that the Decision is incorrect as a matter of law, is not supported by a preponderance of the evidence, is arbitrary and capricious, and is unwarranted by the facts of the record.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff, the Dracut School Committee, prays that this Court affirm the hearing officer's finding that the Student met all of Dracut's and Massachusetts' requirements for graduation and that Dracut may and should graduate the Student from high school; and reverse the finding of the Defendant Bureau of Special Education Appeals of the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary

Education with respect to the Order requiring Dracut to provide the student with two (2) years of additional transition services, to extended special education eligibility for purposes of receiving two (2) years of additional transition services and with respect to the Order requiring Dracut to hire and compensate the Parent's expert witnesses or substitute consultants recommended by the Parent's expert witnesses; and award the Plaintiff such other and further relief as the Court deems just and appropriate.

Dated: June 8, 2009

The Defendant,

Dracut Public Schools

By its attorneys,

and Rogers

Catherine L. Lyons

BBO No. 652725

Amy M. Rogers BBO No. 564721

Sullivan, Nuttall & MacAvoy, P.C.

1020 Plain Street, Suite 270

Marshfield, MA 02050

781-837-7428

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

				STATES DISTRICT CO T OF MASSACHUSE		1:01:	FILE() DEFICE	
E	Title of sees (nam	e of first party on ea	och side only)	racut School Com	ımittee v				
١.				econdary Education	on, et al.	-1		7 I,: U.	<u> </u>
2.	Category in which	the case belongs b	ased upon the n	umbered nature of s	uit code li		civil cove		See local
	l.	160, 410, 470, 535,	R.23, REGARDL	ESS OF NATURE OF	SUIT.				
	vi.			0, 550, 555, 625, 710, 890, 892-894, 895, 9			•	120 or AO irk or copy	121 right cases
	<u> </u>			30, 240, 245, 290, 310 30, 362, 365, 370, 371					
	NV.			55, 480, 490, 510, 530 61-865, 870, 871, 875,					
	v.	150, 152, 153.							
3.	district please inc		imber of the firs	ule 40.1(g)). If more t filed case in this co 19-10561-PBS		prior related	l case has	been filed	i in this
١,	Has a prior action	between the same	parties and base	d on the same claim	ever been	_	s court?		····
5.	Does the complai §2403)	nt in this case quest	ion the constitu	tionality of an act of e	ongress	affecting th	e public in	nterest? (See 28 USC
	If so, is the U.S.A.	or an officer, agent	or employee of	the U.S. a party?	YES	_ _	NO [
S .	is this case requi	red to be heard and	determined by a	district court of three	judges p	oursuant to	title 28 US	C §2284?	
,	Do all of the parti	es in this action, ex	cluding governm	ental agencies of the	YES		NO 🗸 e Commo	nwealth of	,
	Massachusetts ("	governmental agend	ies"), residing i	n Massachusetts res	ide in the		юл? - (Se NO	e Local Ru	ile 40.1(d)).
	A.	If ves. in which div	ision do all of th	e non-governmental	ىنىا parties re	⊶ side?	***************************************		
		Eastern Division		Central Division		Western [)ivision		
	8.		sion do the majo	rity of the plaintiffs o	r the only	parties, ex	cluding go	overnment	al agencies,
		Eastern Division		Central Division		Western E	ivision		
ł.		f Removal - are there sheet identifying th		ending in the state co	ourt requir	——————————————————————————————————————	ntion of th	nis Court?	(If yes,
	LEASE TYPE OR PI	RINT) Catherine L. Lyor	ns						
	_			Street, Suite 270	, Marshf	ield, MA	02050		
	EPHONE NO 781				 `				

(CategoryForm-08.wpd -2/8/08)

≈JS 44 (Rev. 12/07)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS	- Livery	nuthe filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided a September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating DEFENDANTS DEFENDANTS Bureau of Special Education Appeals of the Mass. Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Mass.						
Dracut School Committ	ee							
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plaintiff Middlesex	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Middlesex						
	XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES	(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)						
		NOTE: INLAND CONDEMNAMENCIASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED FIASS						
(c) Attorney's (Furn Num	e, Address, and Telephone Number)		Attorneys (If Known)					
	y M. Rogers, Sullivan, Nuttall & Ma 270, Marshfield, MA 02050 781-8	37-7428						
II. BASIS OF JURISI	OICTION (Place on "X" in One Box Only)				(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)			
□ 1 U.S. Government	■ 3 Federal Question			PTF DEF	PTF DEF			
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government Not a Party)	Citize	en of This State	☐ 1 Incorporated or P of Business In Th				
O 2 US Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Critizenship of Parties in Item II	,	en of Another State	2 2 1 Incorporated and of Business In				
			en or Subject of a freegn Country	J 3 J 3 Foreign Nation				
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only)							
	PEDEGNAL INTERVAL PEDEGNAL IN	1	A Agriculture	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	O 400 State Reapportionment			
110 Insurance 120 Marine	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL IN 310 Amplane 362 Personal Injury	l l	0 Other Food & Drug	1 422 Appeal 28 OSC 138	410 Antitrust			
☐ 130 Miller Act	☐ 315 Airplane Product Med. Maipr	actice 🗇 62	5 Drug Related Scizure	28 USC 157	430 Banks and Banking			
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability 365 Personal Ing 360 Assault, Libel & Product Lia		of Property 21 USC 881 0 Liquor Laws	ALEROPERIDANICHISEE	450 Commerce 460 Deportation			
& Enforcement of Judgment	I		ORR & Truck	(7 820 Copyrights	☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and			
☐ 151 Medicare Act	330 Federal Employers' Injury Produ		0 Airbne Regs.	330 Patent	Corrupt Organizations			
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability Liability 340 Manne PERSONAL PRO		0 Occupational Safety/Health	CJ 840 Trademark	☐ 480 Consumer Credit ☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV			
Student Loans (Excl Veterans)	340 Manne PERSONAL PRO 345 Marine Product 370 Other Fraud		0 Other		☐ 810 Selective Service			
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability 371 Truth in Len			ESCHOLUS ESTABLISMES				
of Veteran's Benefits	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 380 Other Person	l l	0 Fair Labor Standards	O 861 HIA (1395ff)	Exchange			
160 Stockholders' Suits	355 Motor Vehicle Property Dai		Act	 862 Black Lung (923) 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 	☐ 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410			
☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	Product Liability 385 Property Da. 360 Other Personal Product Liab		0 Labor/Mgmt Relations 0 Labor/Mgmt Reporting	O 864 SSID Title XVI	3 890 Other Statutory Actions			
196 Franchise	Injury		& Disclosure Act	○ 865 RSI (405(g))	391 Agricultural Acts			
BERNYLLKOW KAY	ENGLARICHI SEREE PRISONER PETT		0 Railway Labot Act	FADERAL PANSURO				
210 Land Condemnation	O 441 Voting O 510 Motions to V		0 Other Labor Lidgation	370 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	893 Environmental Matters			
220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	442 Employment Sentence 443 Housing Habeas Corpus		I Empl. Ret Inc. Security Act	or Defridant) 7 871 IRS—Third Party	3 894 Energy Allocation Act 3 895 Freedom of Information			
240 Torts to Land	Accommodations 530 General		Security 7101	26 USC 7509	Act			
245 Tost Product Liability	☐ 444 Welfare ☐ 535 Death Penal		IMMIGRATION		900Appeal of Fee Determination			
290 All Other Real Property	445 Amer, w/Disabilities - 540 Mandamus &		2 Naturalization Applicatio	n [Under Equal Access to Justice			
	Employment 550 Civil Rights 446 Amer w/Disabilines - 555 Prison Cond		3 Habeas Corpus - Alten Detamee		3 950 Constitutionality of			
	Other		5 Other Immigration		State Statutes			
	■ 440 Other Civil Rights		Actions					
🖾 1 Original 🗇 2 R	an "X" in One Box Only) emoyed from		Station of J arrest	sferred from 6 Multidist				
Proceeding S	tate Court Appellate Court		(sner	Linganoi	Judgment			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	ON Cate the U.S. Civil Statute under which y 20 U.S.C. 1415 Brief description of cause	on are tilling (no not cue Incisaterio	nai scarnies uniess diversity)				
	Review of state due process	decision -	education		***************************************			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACT UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	ION DI	EMAND S	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND	if demanded in complaint : 3 Yes 🗗 No			
VIII. RELATED CAS	E(S) (See instructions) JUDGE Saris		-	DOCKET NUMBER 0	9-10561-PBS			
DATE	SIGNATURE O	FATTORNEY	OF RECORD					
06/08/2009								
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY								