1

Case No. SACV 08-00077 JVS (MLGx)

Amended Judgment

Defendant Charter Oak Unified School District's ("COUSD") Motion for Summary Judgment.

All parties appeared through counsel, as reflected by the record. The Court issued an order on June 18, 2009 GRANTING THE OCDE's Motion, DENYING THE CDE'S Motion, GRANTING THE LAUSD's Motion, and GRANTING THE COUSD's Motion ("Order").

The CDE subsequently appealed the Order to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. On December 28, 2011, the Ninth Circuit issued its decision ("Decision"), reversing and remanding, in part, the Court's June 18, 2009 Order.

In accordance with the Court's June 18, 2009 Order and the Ninth Circuit's December 28, 2011 Decision, the Court hereby ENTERS ITS AMENDED JUDGMENT as follows:

On The OCDE's Claims Against A.S. And The Office Of Administrative Hearings:

- 1) The Decision rendered by the hearing officer at the October 31, 2007 hearing of the Office of Administrative Hearings ("OAH"), in Case No. N2006100050, is hereby reversed.
- 2) As of June 8, 2006, the OCDE did not have, and the OCDE does not now have, any obligation to implement or fund any portion of the Individualized Educational Program ("IEP") for the student known in this proceeding as "A.S.," including his out-of-state placement at the residential treatment facility at Cinnamon Hills, Utah.
- 3) The CDE is the entity entirely responsible for implementing and funding A.S.' educational program for the period between July 28, 2006 and October 10, 2007. This responsibility includes the out-of-state placement of A.S. at the residential treatment facility at Cinnamon Hills, Utah.
- 4) On October 10, 2007, the Orange Unified School District (OUSD) became the educational agency responsible for implementing and funding A.S.' educational program. This responsibility includes the out-of-state placement of A.S. at the residential treatment facility at Cinnamon Hills, Utah.
- 5) Judgment is entered in favor of the OCDE.

- 6) The OCDE is the prevailing party for purposes of the underlying OAH hearing from which the OCDE appeals.
- 7) The OCDE is the prevailing party for purposes of its claims against A.S. and the OAH in this Action.

On The OCDE's Claims Against The CDE:

- 1) Judgment is entered partially in favor of the OCDE and against the CDE and partially in favor of the CDE and against the OCDE.
- 2) As of June 8, 2006 the OCDE did not have, and the OCDE does not now have, any obligation to implement or fund any portion of A.S.' educational program, including his out-of-state placement at the residential treatment facility at Cinnamon Hills, Utah.
- 3) The CDE is the entity entirely responsible for implementing and funding A.S.' educational program for the period between July 28, 2006 and October 10, 2007. This responsibility includes A.S.' out-of-state placement at the residential treatment facility at Cinnamon Hills, Utah.
- 4) On October 10, 2007, the OUSD became the educational agency responsible for implementing and funding A.S.' educational program. This responsibility includes the out-of-state placement of A.S. at the residential treatment facility at Cinnamon Hills, Utah.
- 5) The OCDE is a partially prevailing party for purposes of its claims against the CDE in this Action, and the CDE is a partially prevailing party for purposes of the OCDE's claims against the CDE in this Action.
- 6) The OCDE shall recover its reasonable costs of suit herein as against the CDE in the amount of \$438.55.
- 7) The OCDE shall recover reimbursement for all costs it incurred for funding A.S.' educational program for the period between July 28, 2006 and October 10, 2007 in the amount of \$44,298.75. This reimbursement includes A.S.' out-of-state placement at the residential treatment facility at Cinnamon Hills.

1	8) This Court retains jurisdiction over the parties to the extent necessary to allow the
2	OCDE to obtain reimbursement from the CDE as described herein.
3	On The OCDE's Claims Against The LAUSD:
4	1) Judgment is entered in favor of the LAUSD.
5	2) As of July 28, 2006, the LAUSD did not have, and the LAUSD does not now have,
6	any obligation to implement or fund any portion of A.S.' educational program, including
7	his out-of-state placement at the residential treatment facility at Cinnamon Hills, Utah.
8	3) The LAUSD is a prevailing party for purposes of this appeal.
9	On The OCDE's Claims Against The COUSD
10	1) Judgment is entered in favor of the COUSD.
11	2) As of July 28, 2006, the COUSD did not have, and the COUSD does not now have,
12	any obligation to implement or fund any portion of A.S.' educational program, including
13	his out-of-state placement at the residential treatment facility at Cinnamon Hills, Utah.
14	3) The COUSD is a prevailing party for purposes of this appeal.
15	
16	
17	Dated: March 06, 2012
18	By: James V/klu
19	HON. JAMES V. SELNA
20	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	Casa No. SACV 08 00077 IVS (MLGv) Amandad Judgmant