

FINAL DECISION

Sent via email [REDACTED]

Certified Mail [REDACTED]

April 14, 2026

RE: Final Decision

Dear [REDACTED]

On March 2, 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, Hearing Officer
Kathleen Murphy, Ph.D., Director, Eligibility Unit
Margret Rudin, Ph.D., Psychologist Eligibility Unit
Attorney Marjorie O. Wakeman, Director, Legal & Government Affairs

ct.gov/dds

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

IN RE:

FEBRUARY 20, 2026

INTRODUCTION:

On February 20, 2026 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 September 25, 2025 by the Applicant, [REDACTED]

Name of Attendees:

[REDACTED]	Applicant
Dr. Margaret Rudin	DDS Psychologist Eligibility Unit
[REDACTED]	Applicant's Aunt
[REDACTED]	Applicant's [REDACTED] Support Worker

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	Denial of Eligibility Dated 8/25/2025
HO-2	Request for hearing Dated 9/25/2025
HO-3	Notice of hearing Dated 9/30/2025
DDS-1	DDS Eligibility Application 5/27/2025
DDS-2	Eligibility Letter 6/27/2025
DDS-3	Eligibility Letter 8/25/2025
DDS-4	Second Review by Dr. Margaret Rudin, Ph.D. 7/7/2025
DDS-5	Individualized Education Plan [REDACTED]
DDS-6	Health Evaluation 2/15/2004
DDS-7	Student Performance Summary [REDACTED]
DDS-8	School Assessment Grade [REDACTED]
DDS-9	Final Transcript [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 [REDACTED] months old.
3. That the Applicant grew up in Pennsylvania as such records provided were from her schooling in Pennsylvania. (DDS Exhibits 5-9).

4. That the Applicant does not have IQ test scores to provide before the age of 18 and it is unknown whether or not IQ testing was ever done. (Testimony [REDACTED])
5. That the Applicant's school records indicate a primary disability of hearing impairment and vision impairment. (Testimony M. Rudin, DDS Exhibits 5-9)
6. That the Applicant's school transcript indicates that she graduated with a rank of 37 out of 107 students. (Testimony M. Rudin, DDS Exhibit 9)
7. That the Applicant's grades shown on her school transcript are not consistent with someone with an Intellectual Disability. (Testimony M. Rudin, DDS Exhibit 9).
8. That currently that Applicant works as a receptionist at the [REDACTED] program part time and also receives assistance from the [REDACTED] Program to give her support in the community. (Testimony [REDACTED])

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 may require assistance, guidance and support there is not any testing or information supplied to DDS to establish that she is intellectually disabled pursuant to Connecticut General Statute. 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 does not meet the criteria for services as defined in Connecticut General Statute Section 1-1g. There has not been sufficient testing or evidence supplied at this time in support of the application, therefore, she

does 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



Hearing Officer

Wendy Mongillo