#### STATE OF MICHIGAN

# MICHIGAN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING SYSTEM ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN THE MATTER OF:

Issue

Reg. No.: 200915033

> No.: 1030

Case No.:

Hearing Date: May 18, 2011

DHS County: Washtenaw County

DHS (20)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Susan C. Burke

### HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Admini strative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon the Departm ent of Human Servic es' (Department) request for a Debt Collection hearing. After due notice, a telepho ne hearing was held on May 18, 2011. The Department was represented by Recoupment Specialist. Respondent did not appear at the hearing.

# ISSUE

Did the Respondent r eceive an overissuance of Family Independence Program (FIP) benefits?

## FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

- 1. Respondent was a recipient of FIP during the period of April of 2005 through August of 2005.
- 2. During the aforementioned period Respondent received income that was not budgeted by the Department.
- 3. As a result, Respondent received an overissuance in FIP benefits in the amount of \$805.00 for the period of April 2005 through August 2005.
- Respondent did not sign a repay agreement.

- 5. Respondent's last known address was
- 6. A Notice of Debt Collection Hearing was sent to Res pondent at her last k nown address on April 11, 2011.
- Respondent failed to appear at the hearing, whic h was conducted in her absence.

# CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

FIP was e stablished pursuant to the Pers onal Resp onsibility a nd Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 8 USC 601, *et seq.* The Department administers the FIP program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MAC R 400.3101-3131. Department policies are found in the Bridges Administ rative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Program Reference Manual.

When a c lient group receives more benefit's than they are entitled to receive, DHS must attempt to recoup the overissuance (OI). BAM,700, p. 1.

In the present case, Respondent receiv ed income that was not budgeted by the Department. As a result, Respondent receiv ed overissuance of FIP benefits in the amount of \$805.00 for the period of April of 2005 through August of 2005. Respondent did not sign a repay agreement. Notice of the is hearing was sent to Respondent at her last known address and therefore I find that Respondent was notified of these proceedings. Respondent was not present at the hearing. I find that Respondent owes the Department \$805.00 for FIP benefit overissuance.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusion sof law, finds that Respondent received an overissuance of FIP benefits in the amount of \$805.00. It is therefore ORDERED that Respondent reimburse the Department the sum of \$805.00 for FIP overissuan ce and that the Department shall initiate collection procedures in accordance with Department policy.

/s/\_\_\_\_ Susan C. Burke Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

#### 2009-15033/SCB

Date Signed: May 27, 2011

Date Mailed: May 27, 2011

**NOTICE**: Administrative Hearings April or der a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a party within 30 days of the mailing date of this Decision and Order. Administrative Hear ings will not orde rarehearing or reconsideration on the Department's motion where the final decision cannot be implemented within 90 days of the filing of the original request.

The Claimant April appeal the Decision and Order to Circuit Court within 30 days of the mailing of the Decision and Order or, if a ti mely request for rehearing was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the rehearing decision.

#### SCB/ctl

