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



Reg. No. Issue No. Case No. Hearing Date: 201132272 6021

July 6, 2011 Wayne County DHS (49)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Christian Gardocki

# 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 July 6, 2011 fr om D etroit, Michigan. The Claimant appeared and testified. On behal f of Department of Huma n Services (DHS), Specialist, appeared and testified.

## <u>ISSUE</u>

Whether Claimant timely requested a hearing concerning a denial of Child Development and Care (CDC) benefits.

# FINDINGS OF FACT

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

- 1. On an unspecified date, Claimant applied for CDC benefits.
- 2. On 9/7/10, DHS mailed Claimant a Noti ce of Cas e Action (Exhibit 1) denying Claimant's application for CDC benefits on the basis that Claimant failed to verify information.
- 3. Claimant reapplied for CDC benefits on 4/8/11.
- 4. On 4/27/11, DHS appr oved Claimant's CDC benefits (see Exhibit 2) and her requested CDC provider for CDC benefit eligibility effective 3/27/11.

#### 2011-32272/CG

5. On 5/3/11, Claimant requested a heari ng to disput e the failure by DHS to approve Claimant for CDC benefits from 9/2010.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Child Development and Care program is established by Ti tles IVA, IVE and XX of the Social Security Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 1990, and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. The program is implemented by Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 98 and 99. DHS (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) provides s ervices to adults a nd children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and M AC R 400.5001-5015. Depa rtment policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Ma nual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

The undersigned will refer to the DHS regulations in effect as of 9/2010, the month of the DHS decision in which Cla imant is disputing. Current DHS manuals may be found online at the following URL: <u>http://www.mfia.state.mi.us/olmweb/ex/html/</u>.

BAM 600 contains the DHS policy for adminis trative hearings including the client deadline to file a hear ing request. Clients h ave 90 calendar days from the date of the written notice of case action to request a hearing. BAM 600 at 4.

In the present case, Claimant disputed an alleged failure by DHS to approve her and/or her CDC provider for CDC ben efits from 9/2010. DHS subm itted a Notic e of Cas e Action (NCA) (Exh ibit 1) which verified that Claimant's CDC be nefits for 9/2010 were denied on 9/7/10. The Notic e of Case Action would h ave served as written notice to Claimant of the denial. The address on the NCA matched the mailing address Claimant provided at the administrative hearing though Claimant did not deny receiving the NCA.

Claimant did not request an admin istrative hearing until 5/3/11, slightly les s than eight months from the date of t he denial for 9/2010 CDC be nefits. Claimant stated that she was unaware of her right to an administrative hearing and was attempting to resolve the issue at the DHS lev el during the eigh t month period between the denial and her hearing request. Claimant's ex planation may be reasonable, but is not a valid exc use for failing to timely request a hearing. It is found that Claimant did not timely request a hearing to dispute a 9/2010 DHS action concerning CDC benefits.

Claimant's hearing request appeared to be in response to the 4/2011 approv al for CDC benefits. Claimant's request was timely to dispute the 4/2011 action. Thus, it must be determined whether Cla imant was entitled to 9/2010 CDC ben efit eligibility based on Claimant's 4/8/11 application.

2011-32272/CG

BAM 115 outlines the eligibility effective d ates for DHS programs. For CDC b enefits, the first day that care may be authorized is the latest of the following:

- the CDC application receipt date;
- the date the child care need begins;
- the date the provider becomes eligible for subsidy payments; or
- the date the unlicensed provider completes the basic training requirement. BAM 115 at 18.

Not all of the above dates ar e known. It is known that Claimant reapplied for CDC benefits on 4/8/11. Based on the above policy, it is known that Claimant would not have been entitled to CDC benefits for any date prior r to the application date. DHS approved Claimant and her CDC pr ovider effective 3/27/11 (the begi nning date of the pay period containing 4/8/11). It is f ound that DHS properly determined Claimant's eligibility for CDC benefits effective 3/27/11 based on Claimant's 4/8/11 application date.

Note that this decis ion does not address w hether DHS properly or improperly denied Claimant's application from 8/2010 or 9/2010; again, that issue may not be decided due to the lack of timeliness in Claimant's hearing request. Based on the presented evidence, it does appear that DHS may hav e improperly denied the applic ation. Though the undersigned lacks the authority to order DHS to correct an improper denial when the hearing request was not timely m ade, DHS is not prevented from correcting wrongly denied benefits on their own accord.

### DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon t he above findings of fact and conclusion s of law, finds that Claimant failed to time ly request a hearing concerning a 9/2010 den ial of CDC benefits. Claimant's hearing request is PARTIALLY DISMISSED.

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon t he above findings of fact and conclusion s of law, finds that DHS properly determine d the begin date as 3/27/11 for Claimant's CDC b enefits based on the 4/8/11 app lication date. The action s taken by DHS ar e PARTIALLY AFFIRMED.

Christian Dordoch

Christian Gardocki Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: July 12, 2011 Date Mailed: July 12, 2011 **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 orde r 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.

CG/cl

