JUL-28-2009 16:54

FX CO CIR CT CHAMBERS

703 385 4432

P.02/03



DENNIS J SWITH, CHIEF JUDGE MICHAEL & MUWEENY MARCUS EL WILLIAMS STANLEY & KLESN POBERT W. WOOLD HEGE, JP, JUNE MARCUS TO STATLES JE MALCON JOHNTHAN C. THICHER PLEERENCE NEY BAYLORD L. BIRCH, JR. PANDY L. BELLOWS CHARLES J. MAXFIELD BRUCE BUTTER HOBERT J. SMITH JUDGES AND LONGES

NINETEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF VIRGINIA

Fairfax County Courthouse 4110 Chain Bridge Road Fairfax, Virginia 22030-4009

709-248-2221 • Sax; 708-385-4452 • TDD, 708-352-4139

COUNTY OF FAIRENX

OTTY OF FAIRFAX

July 28, 2008

BURCH MILLSAP
BARNASTI FLURNINGS
THOMAS A FORTAGHT
HICHARD LINAISCHOSTY
JACK B. STRVIRN
LI HÖMZ BHCRM
FERICCE BACH
M. LANGHORNE KEITH
ARTHUR B. VISABEGG
KATHLERN H. MACKAY
RETHER J. VISABE

Steven D. Stone, Esq. Steven David Stone, P.C. 1004 Prince Street Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Thomas J. Cawley, Esq. Hunton & Williams, L.L.P. 1751 Pinnacle Drive, Suite 1700 McLean, Virginia 22102

Re: Joe Pascale, et al v. Fairfax County School Board; CL 2008-4186

Dear Counsel:

This matter came before this Court on the Petitioner's request for judicial review of the Respondent Fairfax County School Board's decision approving boundary adjustments for South Lakes, Oakton, Chantilly, Madison, and Westfield High Schools, Thoreau and Hughes Middle Schools, and Wolffrap and Sunrise Valley Elementary Schools. The hearing took place on July 3, 2008 at which time each party presented evidence and testimony. At the conclusion of the hearing, the Court instructed counsel to submit post-trial memoranda. All exhibits, testimony, and arguments have now been reviewed and the Court makes the following findings of fact and conclusions of law.

Petitioners asked the Court, pursuant to Virginia Code § 22.1-87, to find that the boundary adjustment was invalid because it was arbitrary and capricious, an abuse of discretion and outside the School Board's authority.

Virginia Code § 22.1-37 provides:

Any parent, custodian, or legal guardian of a pupil attending the public schools in a school division who is aggreed by an action of the school board may, within thirty days after such action, petition the circuit court having jurisdiction in the school division to review the action of the school board. Such review shall proceed upon the petition, the minutes of the meeting at which the school board's action was taken, the

JUL-28-**20**28 16:54

FX CO CIR OT CHAMBERS

723 385 4432 P.03/03

Stevent D. Stone, Esq. Thomas J. Cmyley, Exq. Re: Jan Patente, et al v. Feirfax County School Bourd CL-2008-4186 July 28, 2098 Page 2 of 2

The Respondent argued that Petitioners lack standing to challenge the boundary adjustment decision and moreover have shown no basis for the Court to overturn the School Board's decision.

The Court must sustain any action of the School Board unless the school board exceeded its authority, acted arbitrarily or capriciously, or abused its discretion. Va. Code. § 22.1-87. Assuming, without deciding, that the Petitioners have standing to bring their claim, the Court finds that the School Board had authority to make the boundary adjustments at issue and further that the School Board did not act arbitrarily or capriciously or abuse its discretion. Therefore, the Court denies the Petition for Review.

Gaylord L. Finch, Jr.

aglora Frile

orders, if any, of the school board, an attested copy of the transcript, if any, of any hearing helore the school board, and any other evidence found relevant to the issues on appeal by the court. The action of the solinol board shall be sustained unless the school board exceeded its authority, acted arbitrarily or exprictously, or abused its discretion.