#### STATE OF MICHIGAN

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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2011-41628

Issue No.: 1038

Case No.:

Hearing Date: August 10, 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 Claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, at elephone hearing was held on August 10, 2011 in De troit, Michigan. Claimant appeared and testified. The Department of H uman Services (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:

- 1. Claimant was an ongoing recipient of FIP.
- 2. On March 23, 2011, the Department i ssued to Claimant a Jobs Education and Training (JET) notice for an appointment on April 4, 2011.
- 3. Claimant received the JE T April 4, 2011 appointment notice on April 4, 2011, after the appointment time of 8:30 a.m.
- 4. Claimant did not attend the April 4, 2011 appointment.

#### 201141628/SB

- 5. The Department issued a Notice of Nonc ompliance on May 4, 2011, stating that Claimant did not participate in work-related activities on March 23, 2011.
- 6. The Department held a phone triage (duage) with Claimant on May 10, 2011.
- 7. The Department issued a F irst Noncom pliance Letter, which Claimant did not sign, assigning Claimant another appointment on May 23, 2011.
- 8. Claimant did not attend the May 23, 2011 appointment.
- 9. The Department closed Claim ant's case, effective July 1, 2011, due to noncompliance with work-related activities.
- 10. Claimant requested a hearing on June 30, 2011.

# **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

FIP was e stablished pursuant to the Pers onal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 8 USC 601, et seq. The Department of Human Services (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 (PRM).

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 requirred 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 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

#### 201141628/SB

penalty duration. BEM 233A. (Emphasis added. ) In addition, a triage must be held within the negative action period. BEM 233A.

In the present case, Claimant testified credibly that she did not attend the JET appointment of April 4, 2011, because she received the not ice for the appointment on that date at a later time than the appointment of 8:30. I find that this is a good c ause reason, i.e. circumstances bey ond her control, for her to not attend the appointment. I also note that the Notice of Noncompliance indicated March 23, 2011, not April 4, 2011, as a date of noncompliance. However, the Department conceded that the correct dat e of noncompliance was April 4, 2011. Since I find that Claimant had good cause to not attend the first appointment of April 4, 2011, it is not n ecessary to address the second missed appointment which occurred after the triage or duage addressing the issue in the Notice of Noncompliance. Based on the above discuss ion, I find that the on to close Claimant's FIP case due t Department was not correct in its decisi 0 noncompliance with work-related activities.

# **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above findings of fact and conclusions of law was not correct in clos ing Claimant's FIP case due to nonc ompliance with work-related ac tivities. It is therefore OR DERED that the Department's decision is REVERSED. It is further ORDERED that the Department shall:

- 1.) Reinstate Claimant's FIP case, effective July 1, 20 11, if Claimant is other wise eligible.
- Restore Claimant's F ood Ass istance Program (FAP) benefits if they were decreased by the close of Claimant's F IP case, effective July 1, 2011, if Claimant is otherwise eligible for FAP.
- 3.) Issue supplements for any missed or increased FIP or FAP payments.

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

Date Signed: 8/16/11

Date Mailed: 8/16/11

### 201141628/SB

**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 illing 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 ti mely request for rehearing was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the rehearing decision.

### SB/sm

