

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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 201149317
Issue No.: 6019
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: November 2, 2011
County: Macomb County DHS (20)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Andrea J. Bradley

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 following Claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on November 2, 2011, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant, [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED], Family Independence Manager.

ISSUE

Did the Department properly deny Claimant's application close Claimant's case for:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA)? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA)? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC)? |

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

1. Claimant applied for benefits received benefits for:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP). | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP). |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP). | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA). |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA). | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC). |

2. On July 1, 2011, the Department
 denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's case
due to non cooperation with the Office of Child Support (OCS).
3. On May 24, 2011, the Department sent
 Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)
notice of the denial. closure.
4. On July 28, 2011, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the
 denial of the application. closure of the case.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Department policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 42 USC 601, *et seq.* The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 1999 AC, Rule 400.3101 through Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996.

The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) program] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 1999 AC, Rule 400.3001 through Rule 400.3015.

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105.

The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is administered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 2000 AACS, Rule 400.3151 through Rule 400.3180.

The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles 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. The Department provides services to adults and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and 1999 AC, Rule 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.

Additionally, the Department testified that it considered the Claimant to be in non-cooperation with the OCS as of May 23, 2011. In support of this, the Department submitted a computer printout showing the May 23, 2011 date. Based on this information, the Department imposed a sanction which impacted the Claimant's FIP and CDC benefits. The Claimant testified that she was in cooperation with the OCS as of May 23, 2011. In support of this testimony, the Claimant submitted a letter from the OCS stating that she was in cooperation with the OCS as of May 23, 2011.

The Department policy states that when a person is noncompliant with OCS and then they become compliant, they must serve a one month penalty for FIP benefits. BEM 255. Further, the Department policy requires that person to reapply for benefits in cases where the impacted programs are FIP and CDC. Based on the Department policy and the above facts, the Department has failed to establish that it acted in accordance with Department policy by imposing a sanction in July of 2011 when the Claimant became complaint in May of 2011. Moreover, with respect to the CDC benefits, the Claimant was not required to serve a one-month penalty. Having said that, the Claimant was required to re-apply once she became compliant with the OCS, in order to resume CDC and FIP benefits. There was a dispute on the notification given by the Department to the Claimant of her duty to reapply and whether that notification was given timely. Given the fact that the Department imposed the sanction in the wrong month, it is more likely than not, that the information regarding the need to reapply was not timely given to the Claimant.

Based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department

properly denied Claimant's application improperly denied Claimant's application
 properly closed Claimant's case improperly closed Claimant's case

for: AMP FIP FAP MA SDA CDC.


DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, finds that the Department
 did act properly. did not act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's AMP FIP FAP MA SDA CDC decision is AFFIRMED REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.

THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO DO THE FOLLOWING WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER:

1. The Department shall remove the negative action dated July 1, 2011 and reinstate the Claimant's benefits from that date on-going in accordance with Department policy.
2. The Department shall supplement the Claimant for any lost benefits she was eligible and qualified to receive but-for the July 1, 2011 negative action, in accordance with Department policy.


Andrea J. Bradley
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 12/13/11

Date Mailed: 12/13/11

NOTICE: Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS) may order 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. MAHS will not order a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's motion where the final decision cannot be implemented within 90 days of the filing of the original request. (60 days for FAP cases)

The Claimant may appeal the Decision and Order to Circuit Court within 30 days of the receipt 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.

Claimant may request a rehearing or reconsideration for the following reasons:

- A rehearing **MAY** be granted if there is newly discovered evidence that could affect the outcome of the original hearing decision.
- A reconsideration **MAY** be granted for any of the following reasons:
 - misapplication of manual policy or law in the hearing decision,
 - typographical errors, mathematical error, or other obvious errors in the hearing decision that effect the substantial rights of the claimant:
 - the failure of the ALJ to address other relevant issues in the hearing decision.

Request must be submitted through the local DHS office or directly to MAHS by mail at
Michigan Administrative Hearings
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request
P. O. Box 30639
Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

AJB/hw

cc:

