

THE ADVOCATE

DR. MARLA F. CRAWFORD'S UNRELENTING ADVOCACY

Dr. Marla F. Crawford Ph.D has argued an unprecedented three cases before high courts, including the U.S. Supreme Court.

Dr. Crawford's unrelenting commitment to be a voice for the voiceless in special education law is demonstrated by her advocacy in these cases.

1. CRAWFORD v. HENRICO SCHOOL BOARD, ET AL

Dr. Crawford secured a Writ of Certiorari to be distributed within the US Supreme Court for conferencing as a pro se litigate. However, four of the Justices did not agree to hear the case and denied it. Out of 10,000 or more Writ of Certiorari filed in the Supreme Court of the United States, Dr. Crawford was able to rank within the 150-170 cases to be distributed for which approximately 100 cases are heard each session.

Dr. Marla Faith Crawford argues to protect advocates and parents from Level 3 Acts of Retaliation that represent the educational rights of a student with suspected disabilities (disability currently identified), experiencing homelessness and denied Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE). She and the parent were falsely arrested because of another party in an elementary school and subsequently acquitted by the Circuit Court of Henrico County in Virginia. [NOTE: An adjacent public school system met the student's educational needs, and the student subsequently returned to his LEA of Henrico County Public Schools.]

2. CRAWFORD V. SCHOOL BOARD FOR RICHMOND CITY

This case is making its way through the appeal process and will be filed with the United States Supreme Court. Dr. Crawford argued the debt generated by the School Board for Richmond City for Observations and a Functional Behavioral Assessment ordered by a Hearing Officer as a result of the Due Process Complaint. Dr. Crawford cooperated with agents acting on behalf of the School Board and submitted a bill based on her hourly rate. [Note: Dr. Crawford was an approved vendor of the School Board, with professional fees made available and public.] Counsel for the School Board advised the Court that her client was responsible for the bill under the Individuals with Disabilities Educational Act (IDEA), but refused to pay the bill. The Circuit Court for Richmond City granted sovereign immunity to the School Board, ruled in conflict with IDEA, and the Supreme Court of the United States, ruled in conflict with Virginia's Codes governing public policy and Rules of the Virginia Court while acknowledging that the issue was the debt. But yet, they allowed the School Board to sue Dr. Crawford and ordered her to pay the School Board \$1250 of its \$31000 legal bill and attorneys' fees of \$4600.

3. CRAWFORD V. MARK HERRING (FORMER ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR VIRGINIA) ET AL.

This case is on appeal to the US Circuit Court of the Fourth District after the US District Court for the Eastern District decision. Dr. Crawford argued that the Attorney General's Office presents itself as defense counsel for the Virginia Department of Education in a criminal case to deny witness to benefit their case when the witnesses would have exonerated her by testifying that they were on the phone talking with her about the education of a child with a suspected disability (disability currently identified) and homeless at the time. This case focused on the advocate's ability to meet with school personnel, talk with the Virginia Department of Education, and support the academic needs of students who are disabled and homeless.