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

	_			\sim	
ΙTΗ		ИΔ	 	m	

Reg. No.: 201154423

Issue No.: <u>3014</u>

Case No.:

Hearing Date: October 19, 2011

County: Wayne County DHS (49)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Lynn M. Ferris

SETTLEMENT ORDER

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 October 19, 2011, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included FIM.


ISSUE

Whether the Department properly:	
☐ denied Claimant's application for benefits ☐ closed Claimant's case for benefits ☐ reduced Claimant's 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)? ☐ State Emergency Services (SER)?

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

1.	On 10/1/11, the Department:
	 ☐ denied Claimant's application for benefits ☐ closed Claimant's case for benefits ☐ reduced Claimant's benefits
	under the following program(s):
	☐ FIP ☐ FAP ☐ MA ☐ AMP ☐ SDA ☐ CDC ☐ SER.
2.	On September 7, 2011, the Department sent notice to Claimant (or Claimant's Authorized Hearing Representative) of the:
	☐ denial ☐ closure ☐ reduction.
3.	On September 17, 2011, Claimant filed a request for hearing concerning the Department's action.
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
Eligibi	tment policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges lity Manual (BEM), the Reference Tables Manual (RFT), and the State Emergency Manual (ERM).
Respo 42 US Agend throug	e Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal possibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, SC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence by) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, Rule 400.3101 ph Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program we October 1, 1996.
progra impler Regul Agend	ne Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) am] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is mented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal ations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence by) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, Rule 2001 through Rule 400.3015.



The law provides that disposition may be made of a contested case by stipulation or agreed settlement. MCL 24.278(2).

In the present case, Claimant requested a hearing to dispute the Department's action. Soon after commencement of the hearing, the parties testified that they had reached a settlement concerning the disputed action. Consequently, the Department agreed to do the following: (1.) to reopen the Claimant's Food Assistance case retroactive to 10/1/11, (2.) to seek necessary verification regarding the Claimaint's employment and earned income, (3.) to determine the Claimant's eligibility for food assistance and (4.) to issue a FAP supplement to the Claimant for FAP benefits she was otherwise entitled to receive, if eligible, in accordance with Department policy. (5.) The Department also agreed to provide a shelter verification to the Claimant based upon the Claimaint's testimony at the hearing that she had shelter expense, and upon receipt of the shelter verification the Department agreed to include the shelter expenses in the Claimant's FAP budget calcuation prospectively.

As a result of this settlement, Claimant no longer wishes to proceed with the hearing. As such, it is unnecessary for this Administrative Law Judge to render a decision regarding the facts and issues in this case.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department and Claimant have come to a settlement regarding Claimant's request for a hearing.

THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO DO THE FOLLOWING:

- 1. The Department shall initiate reopening of the Claimant's FAP case retroactive to the date of closure, 10/1/11, and shall determine the Claimant's eligibility for FAP benefits.
- 2. The Department initiate verification of the Claimaint's earned income.
- 3. The Departyment shall issue a supplement to the Claimant for FAP benefits, if she is deemed otherwise eligible for benefits retroactive to the date of closure in accordance with Department policy.
- 4. The Department shall also provide a shelter verification from the Claimant and if the verification is returned by the Claimant the Department shall include the shelter expenses when calculating the Claimaitn's FAP benefits prospectively.

Lynn M. Ferris
Administrative Law Judge

for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: October 21, 2011

Date Mailed: October 21, 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 filling of the original request. (60 days for FAP cases).

2011-54423/LMF

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 <u>MAY</u> 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 to:

Michigan Administrative hearings Reconsideration/Rehearing Request P. O. Box 30639 Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

LMF / hw

