MICHAEL GRUBER, ET AL.	BEFORE THE
Appellants	MARYLAND
v.	STATE BOARD
BALTIMORE COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION	OF EDUCATION
Appellee	Opinion No. 06-36

OPINION

On May 9, 2005, the Appellants filed this appeal from the local board's decision to adjust attendance boundaries of four adjacent schools. This Board referred the case to the Office of Administrative Hearings which conducted an eight day hearing on the matter during the Spring of 2006.

On August 30, 2006, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) issued a 58 page Proposed Decision recommending that the local board's boundary decisions, also known as the Woodholme redistricting plan, be affirmed. All parties were given notice that any exceptions to the ALJ's decision were to be filed within 15 days of receipt of the decision. No exceptions were filed.

We have reviewed the ALJ's decision on the redistricting plan. It is comprehensive, well-reasoned, and his recommendation to affirm the local board is supported by the facts and the law. Accordingly, we adopt the Administrative Law Judge's Proposed Decision as the opinion of this Board and affirm the local board's redistricting decision.[1]

Edward L. Root
President

[1]The ALJ also issued a Proposed Decision on the local board's Motion to Dismiss in which the ALJ found that all of the Appellants except Appellant Moffe had standing to appeal the redistricting decision to the State Board. Because we find that Appellants Olin, Lee, and Weissman clearly had standing to appeal, we need not consider nor do we adopt the ALJ's Proposed Decision on the issue of standing of the other Appellants. We adopt the ALJ's Proposed Decision on the Motion to Dismiss on these grounds only.

Dunbar Brooks
Vice President

Lelia T. Allen

J. Henry Butta

Beverly A. Cooper

Calvin D. Disney

Richard L. Goodall

Tonya Miles

Karabelle Pizzigati

Maria C. Torres-Queral

David F. Tufaro

December 12, 2006