

**STATE OF CONNECTICUT
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

Student v. Torrington Board of Education

Appearing on behalf of the Parents: Attorney Ajaz Fiazuddin
Office of Protection & Advocacy
for Persons with Disabilities
60B Weston Street
Hartford, CT 06120-1551

Appearing on behalf of the Board: Attorney Michelle C. Laubin
Berchem, Moses & Devlin, P.C.
75 Broad Street
Milford, CT 06460

Appearing before: Attorney Patricia M. Strong, Hearing Officer

FINAL DECISION AND ORDER

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Parents' attorney filed a request for an expedited due process hearing on February 10, 2006. On February 14, this Hearing Officer was assigned to the case. The Board received the hearing request on February 15, 2006. A prehearing conference was held on February 21, 2006. The Parents' attorney requested that hearings be conducted in the afternoon to accommodate the Student's disability. The Board's attorney objected to four partial day hearings. The Parents' attorney also requested time to discuss a possible settlement with the Board. The Hearing Officer advised him that since this was an expedited hearing, the hearing must be completed within 20 school days of the hearing request and a decision rendered within 10 school days thereafter. The parties were free to discuss settlement within those parameters. Hearing dates were agreed on for March 6 for the afternoon, March 8 for a full day and March 13 for the afternoon. The decision deadline was set at March 30, 2006. Witness lists and exhibits were due on February 27. On February 27, the Parents' attorney faxed a request for dismissal without prejudice to the Hearing Officer for the reason that the parties were attempting to resolve the dispute over the Student's Manifestation Determination PPT meeting and the expulsion that led to the hearing request. On March 2, the Hearing Officer wrote a letter to the parties advising them that a decision would be issued granting the request and that the hearings for March 6, 8 and 13 were canceled.

FINAL DECISION AND ORDER

It is ordered that this case be dismissed without prejudice.