STATE OF MICHIGAN

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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 201140198

Issue No.: 1038

Case No.:

Hearing Date: August 3, 2011

Wayne County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Susan Burke

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon Claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, at elephone hearing was held on August 3, 2011 in De troit, Michigan. Claimant appeared and testified. The Department of H uman Serv ices (Department) was represented by

ISSUE

Was the Department correct in i ts decision to close Claimant's Family Independence Program (FIP) case due to noncompliance with work-related activities?

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

- Claimant was an ongoing Family Independence Program (FIP) recipient.
- 2. Claimant participated in work-related activities by obtaining and maintaining employment.
- 3. The Department closed Claimant's FIP case April 1, 2011, due to noncompliance with work-related activities.
- 4. Claimant requested a hearing, protesting the closure, on June 22, 2011.

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 consid ered non-compliant for failing o r refusing to appear and participate with the JET Program or other 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 terminated 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 non-compliance, DH S-2444, which must include the date(s) of the noncompliance; the reason the client was determined to be non-compliant; and the penalty duration. BEM 233A. In addition, a triage must be held within the negative action period. BEM 233A A good cause determination is made during the triage and prior to the negative action effective date. BEM 233A

In the pres ent case, the Department alleged that Claimant did not comply with wor krelated activities. However, Claimant testified credibly that she began a job on the day she was to report to Work First. Claimant testified further that she received a verification of employ ment form after her FIP case was sanc tioned. Be cause Claimant was working, I cannot find that Claimant was in noncom pliance nor can I find that the Department was correct in its decision to close Claimant's FIP case for noncompliance. It is noted that the testimony from the Department representative indicated that Claimant's case was closed due to noncompli ance, not due to failure to verify or cooperate. However, ev en if the Department closed Claimant's case due to failure to verify, I find that the Department's decisio n was not correct, as the Depar tment told Claimant that the D epartment sanctioned Claim ant's case prior to her receiving the

201140198/SB

verification request, thus giving Claimant the understanding that her best avenue was to request a hearing.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above findings of fact and conclusions of law decides that the Department was not correct in its decision to close Claimant's FIP case, and it is therefore ORDERED that the Department's decision is REVERSED. It is further ORDERED that the Department shall:

- 1. Reinstate Claimant's FIP case effective April 1, 2011, if she is otherwise eligible.
- Issue Claimant supplements for missed payments.

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

Date Signed: 8/12/11

Date Mailed: 8/12/11

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.

SB/sm

cc: