STATE OF MICHIGAN

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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 201123487

Issue No.: 1038

Case No.: Load No.:

Hearing Date: April 7, 2011

County: Wayne

DHS

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 Claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on April 7, 20 11. Claimant appeared and testified. FI JET Case Manager, appeared on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department or DHS).

ISSUE

Was the Department correct in denying Claimant's Family Independence Program (FIP) application due to noncompliance with employment and/or work-related activities?

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

- Claimant applied for FIP on January 20, 2011.
- 2. As a recipient of FIP, Claimant was required to participate in employment-related activities.
- 3. To fulfill the is require ment, Claimant was assigned to the Jobs, Education and Training (JET) program.
- 4. On January 20, 2011, the Department issued an Appointment Notice to Claimant, giving Claimant the Appointment date of January 31, 2011.

201123487/SCB

- 5. Claimant attempted to contact the Depart ment to notify the Department that she could not attend the appointment due to her having an emergency situation regarding her stored personal items.
- 6. Claimant did not attend the scheduled JET appointment.
- 7. The Department denied Clai mant's FIP applic ation on February 14, 2011, for failure to attend JET.
- 8. Claimant requested a hearing, protesting the denial.

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 Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Program Reference Manual.

The Depar tment requires clients to partici pate in employment and s elf-sufficiencyrelated activities and to accept employment when offered. BEM 230A; BEM 233A. All Work Eligible Indiv iduals (WEIs) are required to participate in the development of a Family Self-Sufficiency Pla n (F SSP) u nless good c ause e xists. BEM 228. As condition of eligibility, all WEIs must enga ge in employment and/ or self-sufficiencyrelated activities. BEM 233A. The WEI is considered non-compliant for failing or refusing to appear and participate with the JET Program or othe r employment service provider. BEM 233A. Good cause is a valid reason for noncompliance with employment and/or s elf-sufficiency-related activities that are bas ed on factors that are beyond the control of the noncompliant per son. BEM 233A. Failure to comply without good cause results in FIP closure. BEM 2 33A. The first and second occ urrences of non-compliance result in a th ree-month FIP closure. BE M 233A. The third occurrence results in a twelve-month sanction. The goal of The FIP penalty policy is to bring the client into compliance. BEM 233A.

JET participants will not be te rminated from a JET program without first scheduling a triage meeting with the client to jointly discuss noncompliance and good cause. BEM 233A. In processing a FIP closure, the Department is required to send the client a Notice of Noncompliance (DHS-2444) which must include the date(s) of the noncompliance; the reason the client was determined to be noncompliant; and the penalty duration. BEM 233A. In addition, a triage must be held within the negative action period. BEM 233A.

201123487/SCB

In the present case, Claimant testified credibly that although she received the JET Notice of Appointment, she could not a ttend the appointment due to a conflict wit h emergency action she had to take regarding st orage of her per sonal property. More specifically, Claimant was required to be at the storage facility where her property was stored at the same time of the JET app ointment, or her property would have been subject to disposal. Claim ant presented a receipt at t he hearing from the storage facility, which was read into the record. The Depart ment did not dispute Cla imant's Claimant had good caus testimony. I find that e, that is, a valid reason for noncompliance with employment and/or self-sufficiency-related activities. BEM 233A. Based on the above discussion. I find that the Depar tment was incorrect in denying Claimant's FIP application.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusion sof law, decides that the Department was incorrect in its decision to deny Claimant's FIP application, and it is therefore ORDERE but the Department's decision is REVERSED. It is further ORDE RED that Claimant's FIP application shall be reinstated and reprocessed with the application date of January 20, 2011, and that any missed payments shall be made in the form of a supplement if Claimant is found to be eligible.

Susan C. Burke
Administrative Law Judge
For Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: May 3, 2011

Date Mailed: May 3, 2011

NOTICE: Administrative Hearings may 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 may 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.

201123487/SCB

SCB/ hw

