#### STATE OF MICHIGAN

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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 201124801

Issue No.: <u>1000</u>

Case No.: Load No.:

Hearing Date: April 11, 2011

Wayne County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Susan C. Burke

### **HEARING DECISION**

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon the Claimant 's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on April 11, 2011. Claimant appeared and testified. The Department of Human Services (Department) was represented by FIM.

## <u>ISSUE</u>

Was the Department correct in its dete Independence Program (FIP) case?

rmination to close Claimant's Family

## **FINDINGS OF FACT**

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

- 1. ) Claimant was an ongoing recipient of FIP.
- 2. ) The Department closed Claimant's FIP case.
- 3. ) Clamant requested a hearing protesting the closure.
- 4. ) At the hearing, the Department agreed to reinstate Claimant's FIP case and restore benefits, effective March 1, 2011. As a re-sult of the agreement, Claimant indicated that she no longer wished to proceed with the hearing.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

The Family Independence program (FIP) was es tablished pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 8 USC 601, et seq. T he Department administers the FIP progr am pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MAC R 400.3101-3131. Departm ent policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

Under Bridges Administrative Manual Item 600, clients have the right to contest any agency decision affecting eligibility or benefit levels whenever they believe the decision is illegal. The Dep artment provides an Administrative Hearing to review the decision and determine if it is appropriate. Department policy includes procedures to meet the minimal requirements for a fair hearing. E fforts to clarify and resolve the client's concerns start when the Department receives a hearing request and continues through the day of the hearing.

In the present case the Department has agreed to reinstate Claimant's FIP case and restore benefits, effective March 1, 2011. As a result of this agreement, Claimant indicated she no longer wished to proceed with the hearing. Since the Claimant and the Department have come to an agreement, it is unnecessary for this Administrative Law Judge to make a decision regarding the facts and issues in this case.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusion is of law decides that the D epartment and Claimant have come to a settlement regarding Claimant's request for a hearing. Therefore, it is O RDERED that the Department reinstate Claimant's FIP ca se and restore benefits, effe ctive March 1, 2011, in accordance with this settlement. It is furt her ORDERED that any missed or increased payments will be issued in the form of a supplement.

> Susan C. Burke Administrative Law Judge For Maura Corrigan, Director

Department of Human Services

Jusa C. Bruke

Date Signed: May 3, 2011

Date Mailed: May 3, 2011

### 201124801/SCB

**NOTICE:** Administrative Hearings may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a party wit hin 30 days of the ma iling 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 ti mely request for rehearing was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the rehearing decision.

### SCB/hw

