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

#### IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 201152770 Issue No.: 1021 Case No.: December 5, 2011 Hearing Date: Wayne County DHS (57) County:

## 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 December 5, 2011, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant, Evelyn Goodwyn. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included Family Independence Manager, and , Family Independence Specialist.

#### ISSUE

Did the Department properly  $\boxtimes$  deny Claimant's application  $\square$  close Claimant's case for:

imes	
_	

Family Independence Program (FIP)?

Food Assistance Program (FAP)?

Medical Assistance (MA)?

Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)?

State Disability Assistance (SDA)?

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:



Family Independence Program (FIP). Food Assistance Program (FAP).

Medical Assistance (MA).

- Adult Medical Assistance (AMP).
- State Disability Assistance (SDA).
- Child Development and Care (CDC).

- 2. In January of 2011, the Claimant began acting as a foster parent for a minor child and that child was placed in the Claimant's home.
- 3. At the time of the application, the minor child was active on another FIP case with the Department.
- On August 9, 2011, the Department
   Iclosed Claimant's case
   due to the Claimant not having an eligible child in the home and therefore failing to meet program requirements.
- 5. On August 9, 2011, the Department sent
   □ Claimant □ Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the □ denial. □ closure.
- 6. On August 19, 2011, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the  $\square$  denial of the application.  $\square$  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 policy states that the primary caretaker is the person who is primarily responsible for the child's day-to-day care and supervision in the home where the child sleeps more than half the days in a month, when averaged over a twelve-month period. BEM 210. The twelve-month period begins at the time the determination is being made. BEM 210. The Department must re-evaluate primary caretaker status when a second caretaker applies for assistance for the same child. BEM 210.

The Department testified that the minor child at issue in this case was active on another person's FIP benefits at the time the Claimant applied for benefits for the minor child. The Claimant offered credible and unrebutted testimony, as well as provided documentary support, to show that the minor child was living in the Claimant's home as of January 2011, and that the Claimant was the foster parent for the minor child.

Under the above-stated policy and facts, the Department had an obligation to reevaluate the primary cartaker in this case, prior to denying the Claimant's application. To that end, the Department has failed to establish that it acted in accordance with Department policy when it denied the Claimant's application.

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

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 i did act properly. i did not act properly. Accordingly, the Department's  $\square$  AMP  $\boxtimes$  FIP  $\square$  FAP  $\square$  MA  $\square$  SDA  $\square$  CDC decision is  $\square$  AFFIRMED  $\boxtimes$  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 register and initiate processing of the Claimant's July 16, 2011 application in accordance with Department policy.
- 2. The Department shall supplement the Claimant for lost benefits she was eligible and otherwise qualified to receive pursuant to the July 16, 2011 application in accordance with Department policy.

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

Date Signed: <u>12/29/11</u>

Date Mailed: <u>12/29/11</u>

**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

# 201152770/AJB

# AJB/ hw

