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

## **IN THE MATTER OF:**

	Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date:	2011-51128 1002 October 3, 2011		
	County:	Wayne County DHS (43)		
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Lynn M. Ferri	s			
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 selephone hearing was held on October 3, 2011, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant and Claimant. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) ncluded , JET Case Manager.				
<u>ISSUE</u>				
Did the Department properly ⊠ deny Claimant's application ☐ close Claimant's case for:				
Family Independence Program (FIP)? Food Assistance Program (FAP)? Medical Assistance (MA)?	_	sistance (AMP)? ssistance (SDA)? ent and Care (CDC)?		
Did the Claimant timely request a hearing regarding the Department's failure to pay her CDC benefits ?				
FINDINGS OF FACT				
The Administrative Law Judge, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:				
Claimant ⊠ applied for benefits □ received benefits for:				
	Adult Medical As	ssistance (AMP).		

	Food Assistance Program (FAP). Medical Assistance (MA).	<ul><li>State Disability Assistance (SDA).</li><li>Child Development and Care (CDC).</li></ul>
$\boxtimes$ de	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	sed Claimant's case oplaince without good cause imposed by
$\boxtimes$ C	August 15, 2011 , the Department sent Claimant	Representative (AR)
	$3/11/11$ , Claimant filed a hearing reques lenial of the application. $\ \ \square$ closure of the	• •
	CONCLUSIONS	S OF LAW
	ment policies are contained in the Brid Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Refer	dges Administrative Manual (BAM), the ence Tables Manual (RFT).
Respons 42 USC Agency) through	sibility and Work Opportunity Reconcil C 601, et seq. The Department (formed) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.	vas established pursuant to the Personal iation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, erly known as the Family Independence 10, et seq., and 1999 AC, Rule 400.3101 to Dependent Children (ADC) program
program impleme Regulati Agency)	n] is established by the Food Stamented by the federal regulations contactions (CFR). The Department (forme	merly known as the Food Stamp (FS) p Act of 1977, as amended, and is ined in Title 7 of the Code of Federal ly known as the Family Independence 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, Rule
Security The De	Act and is implemented by Title 42 of epartment of Human Services (former) administers the MA program pursua	stablished by the Title XIX of the Social the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). ly known as the Family Independence ant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MCL
	e Adult Medical Program (AMP) is estered by the Department pursuant to MC	established by 42 USC 1315, and is CL 400.10, et seq.
for disal	abled persons, is established by 2004	ram, which provides financial assistance PA 344. The Department of Human pendence 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 Claimant's FIP case was closed on 3/1/11 for a 12 month period due to non compliance with work related activities without good cause. Exhibits 1 and 3. The Claimant reapplied for FIP on June 30, 2011 and the application was denied due to the fact that the 12 month sanction was still in effect. When the Department imposed a 12 month sanction and closed the Claimant's case on 3/1/11 for 12 months the Claimant was aware that her cash assistance was closed as of 3/1/11 when her Bridge card no longer worked. Additionally, the Notice of Case Action closing the Claimant's case for a 12 month period was sent to the Claimant's correct address and was received as a matter of law. Exhibit 4. This conclusion is reached due to the fact that a letter properly addressed and sent is presumed to be received by the person to whom it is addressed. The Claimant's testimony did not provide a basis for a finding that the notice was not received. The proper time for challenging the closure of the Claimant's FIP case for non compliance was within 90 days of the notice closing the case. The Claimant must wait 12 months from March 1, 2011 to reapply for cash assistance. The Department properly denied the Claimant's June 30, 2011 FIP application.

The Claimant also sought review of Child Development and Care (CDC) benefits, which were not paid to her provider beginning in November 2010 through February 2010 (11). The Claimant did not request a hearing until August 11, 2011 The client has the right to request a hearing for any action, failure to act or undue delay by DHS; see BAM 600. The client or authorized hearing representative has 90 calendar days from the date of the written Notice of Case Action to request a hearing. The request must be received anywhere in DHS within the 90 days. In this case the Claimant knew that any failure to act had occurred at least by February 3, 2011, as her hearing request indicates that she listed the end date when CDC benefits were not received as 2/3/11. Based on the record presented, the Claimant had 90 days to request a hearing from 2/3/11 and did not do so. The Claimant's hearing request of August 11, 2011 regarding review of CDC eligibility was not timely.

Based upon the above Findings of Fact a stated on the record, the Administrative La	and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons w Judge concludes that the Department
<ul><li>     □ properly denied Claimant's application     □ properly closed Claimant's case     □</li></ul>	improperly denied Claimant's application improperly closed Claimant's case
for: 🗌 AMP 🖾 FIP 🗌 FAP 🗌 MA 🗌 SD	DA 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 $\square$ did act properly. $\square$ did not act properly.
Accordingly, the Department's $\square$ AMP $\boxtimes$ FIP $\square$ FAP $\square$ MA $\square$ SDA $\square$ CDC decision is $\boxtimes$ AFFIRMED $\square$ 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 Claimant's request for hearing as regards her eligibility for CDC benefits is DISMISSED as untimely.

Lynn M. Ferris
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: October 11, 2011

Date Mailed: October 11, 2011

**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 <u>MAY</u> 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

## LMF/hw

