

FINAL DECISION

Sent via email [REDACTED] Certified Mail [REDACTED]

3/24/2026



RE: Final Decision

Dear [REDACTED]

On 2/9/2026 the proposed decision of the hearing officer regarding the eligibility of [REDACTED] to receive services of the Department of Developmental Services was sent to you and all parties. Parties had ten (10) business days from receipt of the proposed decision to submit comments in support or opposition. Comments were not submitted by the petitioner. No comments were submitted on behalf of DDS.

After reviewing the proposed decision, the record, including exhibits submitted at the hearing, I agree with the hearing officer, adopt the Proposed Decision as the Final Decision, and find that [REDACTED] is ineligible for services of the Department of Developmental Services pursuant to Connecticut General Statute section 1-1g.

If you do not agree with this decision, you have the right, in accordance with Section 4-183 of the Connecticut General Statutes, to appeal to the Superior Court. Such an appeal must be submitted within forty-five (45) days of the mailing of this final decision.



Jordan A. Scheff
Commissioner

Enclosures

cc: Attorney Wendy Mongillo
Kathleen Murphy, Ph.D., Director, Eligibility Unit
Margret Rudin, Ph.D., Psychologist Eligibility Unit
Marjorie O. Wakeman, Esq., Director, Legal & Government Affairs

ct.gov/dds

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENTAL SERVICES
PROPOSED MEMORANDUM OF DECISION
ELIGIBILITY HEARING

IN RE: [REDACTED]

August 25, 2025

INTRODUCTION:

On August 25, 2025 at 10:00 a.m. a hearing was held at the Department of Developmental Services, 460 Capitol Avenue in Hartford, Connecticut and remotely, via Microsoft Teams, to determine the eligibility of [REDACTED] for services from the Department of Developmental Services (DDS) pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes Section 1-1g. The request for hearing was filed on March 15, 2025 by the Applicant, [REDACTED]

Name of Attendees:

[REDACTED]	Applicant
[REDACTED]	Applicant's Mother
Margaret Rudin, PhD	DDS Psychologist Eligibility Unit

Statement of Issues

Is [REDACTED] eligible for services from the Department of Developmental Services?

Exhibits Entered Into Evidence

The following documents were presented by the parties and admitted into evidence as full exhibits by the undersigned hearing officer:

HO-1	DDS Denial Letter Dated 2/18/2025
HO-2	Request for Hearing Dated 3/15/2025
HO-3	Notice of Hearing Dated 3/20/2025
DDS-1	DDS Eligibility Application Dated 11/7/2024
DDS-2	DDS Denial Letter Dated 2/18/2025
DDS-3	Second Review by Dr. Margaret Rudin, Ph.D. dated 2/10/2025
DDS-4	Speech and Language Reevaluation [REDACTED]
DDS-5	Psychological Re-evaluation [REDACTED]
DDS-6	Psychological Re-evaluation [REDACTED]
DDS-7	Evaluation [REDACTED]
DDS-8	Re-evaluation [REDACTED]
DDS-9	IEP [REDACTED]
DDS-10	IEP [REDACTED]
DDS-11	IEP [REDACTED]

Finding of Facts:

The exhibits entered into evidence, along with sworn testimony at the hearing result in the following findings:

1. The Applicant is a resident of the State of Connecticut as she resides in the Town/ City of [REDACTED] Connecticut.
2. At the time of the hearing, the Applicant, born [REDACTED], was [REDACTED] years old.
3. That educational records indicated that the applicant's educational primary disability was documented as "Specific Learning Disabilities". (DSS Exhibit 4)
4. That despite the fact that records indicate that the Applicant was bi-lingual no bilingual evaluations were conducted (Tesimony M. Rudin, Phd DDS Exhibits 4-11)
5. That it was noted that factors may have negatively impacted the Applicant's test results in that she was inattentive and easily distracted and as such her functioning on cognitive

measures may be an underestimate of her cognitive potential. (Testimony M. Rudin, Phd DDS Exhibit 5)

6. That when the Applicant was ■ years of age a psychological reevaluation was completed where she scored a full scale IQ of 70. (Testimony M. Rudin, Phd DDS Exhibit 5)

Definition of Intellectual Disability:

According to Connecticut General Statutes Section 1-1g, in order to be eligible for supports or services from the Department of Developmental Services for an intellectual disability, an individual must demonstrate significant limitations in intellectual functioning and deficits in adaptive behavior that originated **during** the developmental period before eighteen years of age (emphasis added).

Discussion:

While the Applicant has some challenges and may require assistance, guidance and support there is not enough information provided in the records to establish that she is intellectually disabled pursuant to CT State Statutes. Unfortunately, the record does not demonstrate that the Applicant's deficits in intellectual functioning or adaptive behaviors were significant enough to fall within the intellectually disabled range during the developmental period. As such the statutory requirements of the Connecticut General Statute Section 1-1g have not been satisfied in the present case.

Conclusion:

The Applicant is not eligible for services from the Department of Developmental Services based on intellectual disabilities as she not meet the criteria for services as defined in Connecticut General Statute Section 1-1g. The Applicant, however, may be eligible for services/ benefits through other Federal and State agencies and programs.

This decision shall be submitted to all parties and the Commissioner. The parties may submit written comments in support or opposition to this proposed decision within ten days of receipt hereof.

Respectfully Submitted

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Wendy Mongillo', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Hearing Officer

Wendy Mongillo