

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Z.F, a minor, by and through his parents M.A.F. and J.F. and M.A.F. and J.F individually; L.H. and J.H., minors, by and through their parents J.A. and J.R.H. and J.A. and J.R.H. individually; A.N., a minor, by and through his parents, G.N. and M.R., and G.N. and M.R. individually,

Plaintiffs,

v.

RIPON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, (RUSD);
RIPON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD
OF TRUSTEES; SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY
OFFICE OF EDUCATION; VALLEY
MOUNTAIN REGIONAL CENTER (VMRC),
MODESTO CITY SCHOOLS, MODESTO CITY
SCHOOLS BOARD OF EDUCATION,
RICHARD JACOBS, Executive Director of
VMRC, in his official and individual capacity,
TARA SISEMORE-HESTER, Coordinator for
Autism Services for VMRC, in her official and
individual capacity; VIRGINIA JOHNSON,
Director of Modesto City Schools SELPA, in her
official and individual capacity; SUE
SWARTZLANDER, Program Director for
Modesto City Schools, in her official and
individual capacity and Does 1-200,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:10-CV-00523 TLN-CKD

JUDGMENT

1 VALLEY MOUNTAIN REGIONAL CENTER,
2 RICHARD JACOBS, and TARA SISEMORE-
3 HESTER,

4 Counterclaimants,

5 v.

6 M.A.F. and SPECIAL NEEDS ADVOCATES
7 FOR UNDERSTANDING,


8 Counterdefendants.

9 This matter was before the Court, the Honorable Troy L. Nunley, United States District Court
10 Judge, presiding, on two separate motions for summary judgment. The first of these was filed by
11 Defendant Valley Mountain Regional Center (“VMRC”). The second was filed by Defendants Ripon
12 Unified School District (“RUSD”), Ripon Unified School District Board of Trustees, and San Joaquin
13 County Office of Education (collectively, “RUSD Defendants”). The evidence presented having been
14 fully considered, the issues having been duly heard, and a decision having been duly rendered,

15 **IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDICATED** that judgment is hereby entered in favor of VMRC
16 and RUSD Defendants and against Plaintiffs on Plaintiffs’ Rehabilitation Act Section 504 claim; in
17 favor of VMRC and against Plaintiffs on Plaintiffs’ Unruh Civil Rights Act Claim; and in favor of
18 RUSD Defendants and against Plaintiffs Z.F., A.N., and their respective parents on Plaintiffs’ ADA
19 claim. Plaintiffs’ Complaint shall be dismissed with prejudice.

20
21 **JUDGMENT IS SO ORDERED.**

22
23 Dated: June 13, 2017

24
25 

26 Troy L. Nunley
27 United States District Judge
28