STATE OF MICHIGAN STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN THE MATTER OF:	Reg Issue Case Hearing	No: No: No: Date	2011-21688 1005 e:
Oakland		DH	S (04)
ADMINISTRATIVE LAV	N JUDGE:		
HEARING DECISION			
This matter is be	fore the undersigned Admir	nistrative Law Judge pu	rsuant to MCI

400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon the Claimant's request for a hearing received by the Department on After due notice, a telephone hearing was conducted from Detroit, Michigan on The Claimant appeared and testified. FIM and FIM and Claimant appeared on behalf of the

Department.

ISSUE

Whether the Department properly denied t he Claimant's Cash Assistance (FIP)

application due to Claimant's failure to participate in the work first orientation program.

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the competent, material, and

substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material facts:

- 1. The Claimant applied for Cash Assistance (FIP) on
- 2. An in-pers on interview was sc heduled with the Claimant on at The Claimant did appear for the interview but had to leave due to a family emergency. Exhibit 1

- 4. At the hearing, the D epartment confirmed through its testimony that the reason for the denial of the Claimant's FIP application was because the Claimant failed to attend the second in-person interview to complete the FIP applic ation and not because she failed to attend the work first orientation. The De partment's action denying the application occurred the day before the interview was scheduled to occur.
- 5. After the hearing was c ompleted, the De partment faxe d to the Administrative Law J udge the Notice of Case Action dated whic h denied t he FIP application. The Notice indicated that the Claimant's applic ation was denied becaus e of the Claimant's f ailure to attend the work first orientation. Exhibit 2
- 6. The Work First orientation was to have occurred on the Claimant's FIP application was already denied.
- 7. After the Claimant's application was denied, she supplied a Doctor's note to her cas eworker on indicating that the Claimant was confined to bed rest due to her pregnancy. Exhibit 3
- 8. The Doctor's note was dated
- 9. The Department testified that it closed the Claimant's case on because she had failed to att end the in-person interview with her caseworker. The Department a cknowledged that the denial wa s premature but would have fixed the problem had the Claimant appeared at the sector interview.
- 10. The Claimant questioned why her ca se closed on when she had an appoint ment to attend job link (Work First) on
- 11. The Claim ant request ed a hearing on denial of her FIP Cas h Assistance application. The hearing request was received by the Department on

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Family Independence Program ("FIP") was establis hed pursuant to the

Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public L aw

104-193, 8 USC 601, et seq. The Department of Human Services administers the FIP

program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq* and MAC R 400.3101-3131. The FIP program replaced the Aid to Dependent Children ("ADC") program effective October 1, 1996. Department policies are found in the Br idges Administ rative Manual ("BAM"), the Bridges Eligibility Manual ("BEM"), and the Program Reference Manual ("PRM").

Clients must cooperate with the local offi ce in determining in itial and ongoing eligibility to provide verification. BAM 130, p. 1. The questionable information might be from the client or a third party. Id. The Department can us e documents, collateral contacts or home calls to verify information. Id. ___ The client shou Id b e allo wed 10 calendar days to provide the verification. If the client refuses to provide the information or has not made a reasonable e ffort within the specified time period, then policy directs that a negative action be issued. BAM 130, p. 4.

All Family Independence Program (FIP) and Refugee Assistance Program (RAP) eligible adults and 16- and 17-year-olds not in high school full time must be referred to the Jobs, Education and Training (JET) Program or other employ ment service provider, unless deferred or engaged in activities that meet participation requirement s. These clients must participate in employment and/or self-sufficiency-related activities to increase their employability and to find employment. BEM 230A, p. 1.

In this case, the Department scheduled two in person int erviews with the Claimant so that her FIP appl ication could be signed and any additional information could be obtained by the Department. The D epartment testified at the hearing that it denied the Claimant's FIP application for failure to attend the second in person interview to complete the application. Unfortunately, the Notice of Case Action was not provided to this Administrative Law Judge until after the hearing. The **Claimant's denied due to her failure to** application was denied due to her failure to

3

201121688/LMF

attend the work first orientation, not for her failure to attend the in person interview to complete the FIP application.

The testimony of the Department did not support the denial of the FIP application on the basis that the Claimant di d not attend the work first or ientation. Additionally, the Claimant testified that her appointment at job link was not until **Control** and did not understand why her app lication was denied on **Control**. Because the reason for the denial of the application given at the hearing by the Department was not understood to be for non attendanc e at the work first orient ation, the Claimant was not required to offer further testimony. regarding why her case was closed improperly with regard to alleged non attendance at the work first orientation. The Claimant and this Administrative Law Judge were led to believe that the application was denied due to failure to attend an in person interview.

In this instance, because the tes timony of the Department was inconsistent with its official action denying the application, and the fact that the application was prematurely denied, the D epartment has not sustained its burden of proof, and the denial of the Claimant's application must be reversed.

Based on the foregoing, it is found that the Department's denial of the Claimant's FIP applic ation was not s upported by the hearing te stimony as the department mistakenly believed the applic ation was denied for failure to attend the in person interview with her caseworker, and therefore its determination must be reversed.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds t hat there was not sufficient evidence presented to affirm the Department's actions denying the Claimant FIP application for failure to attend work

first, and therefore, the denial of the Claimant's FIP Cash Assistance application by the

Department is REVERSED.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED:

- 1. The Department sh all reopen and reproce ss the Claimant's FIP application filed and complete the application process.
- 2. The Claimant shall be re-assigned to attend the work first program orientation.

for Department

M. Ferris

Administrative

Law Judge Maura Corrigan, Director of Human Services

Date Signed: 04/21/11

Date Mailed: 04/26/11

NOTICE: Administrative Hearings may or der a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at t he request of a party within 30 days of the mailing date of this Decision and Order. Administrative Hear ings will not order a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's mo tion where the final decis ion cannot be implemented within 90 days of the filing of the original request.

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

LMF/dj

