

**District of Columbia  
Office of the State Superintendent of Education  
Office of Review and Compliance**

**Student Hearing Office  
Terry Michael Banks, Due Process Hearing Officer  
1150 - 5<sup>th</sup> Street, S.E.  
Washington, D.C. 20003  
(202) 698-3819  
Facsimile: (202) 698-3825  
Tmbanks1303@earthlink.net**

OSSE  
STUDENT HEARING OFFICE  
2010 FEB 12 AM 11:58

**Confidential**

<b>STUDENT, through the legal guardian<sup>1</sup></b>	)	Complaint Filed: December 1, 2009
	)	
<b>Petitioner,</b>	)	Hearing Date: None held
	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	Docket No.
	)	
<b>THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA</b>	)	
<b>PUBLIC SCHOOLS</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Respondent.</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Student Attending:</b>	)	
	)	

**HEARING OFFICER'S DECISION**

**Counsel for Petitioner:** Domiento C.R. Hill, Esquire  
James E. Brown & Associates  
1220 L Street, N.W.  
Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 742-2000; Fax: (202) 742-2098

**Counsel for DCPS:** Kendra Berner, Esquire  
Office of the General Counsel, DCPS  
825 North Capitol Street, N.E.; 9<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20002

---

<sup>1</sup> Personal identification information is provided in Appendix A.

## Jurisdiction

This proceeding was invoked in accordance with the rights established under the Individuals With Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (“IDEIA”), 20 U.S.C. Sections 1400 et seq., Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 300; Title V of the District of Columbia (“District” or “D.C.”) Municipal Regulations (“DCMR”); and Title 38 of the D.C. Code, Subtitle VII, Chapter 25.

## Background

Petitioner is a                    year-old student attending

On December 1, 2009, Petitioner filed a Due Process Complaint Notice (“*Complaint*”) alleging that the District of Columbia Public Schools (“DCPS”) had failed to (1) comply with the terms of a Hearing Officer’s Decision (“HOD”), and (2) implement Petitioner’s Individualized Education Program (“IEP”). On February 3, 2010, Petitioner’s counsel filed *Petitioner’s Voluntary Withdrawal, Without Prejudice, of the Administrative Due Process Complaint Notice Filed on or About December 1, 2009* (“*Notice*”). The parent signed a Settlement Agreement on January 11, 2010 (attached to the *Notice*) that provided, *inter alia*, “This Settlement Agreement is in full satisfaction and settlement of all the claims contained in the pending Complaint, including those claims under IDEIA and §504 the Parent now asserts or could have asserted within the statute of limitations as of the date of the signed Settlement Agreement.”

There is no provision in IDEIA, the D.C. Code, or DCPS regulations governing voluntary dismissals. The DCPS Standard Operating Procedures (“SOP”) authorizes withdrawals upon written notice to the DCPS Student Hearing Office and the other parties, but offers no parameters to determine the appropriateness of withdrawals. Superior Court Rule 41(a)(1), which is identical to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a), provides as follows:

(1) By plaintiff; by stipulation.

Subject to the provisions of Rule 23(e), of Rule 66, and of any applicable statute, an action may be dismissed by the plaintiff without order of Court (i) by filing a notice of dismissal at any time before service by the adverse party of an answer or of a motion for summary judgment, whichever first occurs, or (ii) by filing a stipulation of dismissal signed by all parties who have appeared in the action. Unless otherwise stated in the notice of dismissal or stipulation, the dismissal is without prejudice, except that a notice of dismissal operates as an adjudication upon the merits when filed by a plaintiff who has once dismissed in any court of the United States or of any state an action based on or including the same claim.

(2) By order of Court.

Except as provided in paragraph (1) of this subdivision of this Rule, an action shall not be dismissed at the plaintiff's instance save upon order of the Court and upon such terms and conditions as the Court deems proper. If a counterclaim has been pleaded by a defendant prior to the service upon the defendant of the plaintiff's motion to dismiss, the action shall not be dismissed against the defendant's objection unless the counterclaim can remain pending for independent adjudication by the Court. Unless otherwise specified in the order, a dismissal under this paragraph is without prejudice.

This Hearing Officer will follow Superior Court Rule 41. Since the parties have reached a settlement of all pending claims, the Complaint will be dismissed with prejudice.

### **ORDER**

Upon consideration of Petitioner's request for a due process hearing, the Settlement Agreement executed by the parties, and Petitioner's counsel's notice of withdrawal on February 3, 2010, it is hereby

**ORDERED**, that the *Complaint* is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED**, that this Order is effective immediately.

#### **Notice of Right to Appeal Hearing Officer's Decision and Order**

This is the final administrative decision in this matter. Any party aggrieved by the findings and/or decision may bring a civil action in any state court of competent jurisdiction or in a district court of the United States without regard to the amount in controversy within ninety (90) days of the entry of the Hearing Officer's Decision, in accordance with 20 U.S.C. Section 1415(i)(2)(B).

/s/

\_\_\_\_\_  
Terry Michael Banks  
Hearing Officer

Date: February 10, 2010