

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No: 2011-21394  
Issue No: 4060

[REDACTED]

Kent County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Vicki L. Armstrong

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to 7 CFR 273.18, 45 CFR 233.20(a)(13), MCL 400.9, MCL 400.37, MCL 400.43(a), MAC R 400.941 and MCL 24.201, *et seq.*, upon a hearing request by the Department of Human Services (department) to establish an overissuance of benefits to Respondent. After due notice was mailed to Respondent, a hearing was held July 26, 2011, at which Respondent did not appear. This matter having been initiated by the department and due notice having been provided to Respondent, the hearing was held in Respondent's absence in accordance with Bridges Administrative Manual, Item 725.

ISSUE

Whether Respondent received an overissuance of Family Independence Program (FIP) benefits that the department is entitled to recoup?

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

1. Respondent was receiving FIP benefits at all times pertinent to this hearing. (Hearing Summary).
2. On July 30, 2009, the department mailed Respondent a Notice of Case Action informing her that her FIP benefits were closing effective September 1, 2009, because no group member was an eligible child. (Department Exhibits 4-5).

3. During the hearing, the department explained that the child in this case aged out on December 12, 2008. As a result, Respondent was no longer eligible to receive FIP benefits. (Testimony).
4. Respondent received \$474.00 in FIP benefits during the alleged fraud period of May 2009 through July, 2009. If the department had properly closed Respondent's FIP benefits when her child aged out, Respondent would not have been eligible to receive FIP benefits. (Department Exhibits 6-8).
5. On January 22, 2010, the department received a signed Repay Agreement from Respondent. (Department Exhibit 9).

### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 8 USC 601, et seq. The Department of Human Services (DHS or Department) administers the FIP program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MAC R 400.3101-3131. The FIP program replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996. Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

Departmental policy, states that when the client group receives more benefits than the group is entitled to receive, DHS must attempt to recoup the overissuance (OI). Repayment of an OI is the responsibility of anyone who was an eligible, disqualified, or other adult in the program group at the time the OI occurred. Bridges will collect from all adults who were a member of the case. OIs on active programs are repaid by lump sum cash payments, monthly cash payments (when court ordered), and administrative recoupment (benefit reduction). OI balances on inactive cases must be repaid by lump sum or monthly cash payments unless collection is suspended. BAM 725.

In this case, the department admitted that they erred in failing to close Respondent's FIP case when her child aged out in December 2008. As a result, Respondent continued to receive FIP benefits from May 2009 through July, 2009, in the amount of \$158.00 a month to which she was not entitled. Regardless of fault, the department must attempt to recoup the overissuance.

### DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that Respondent received an overissuance of FIP benefits for the time period of May 2009 through July, 2009 that the department is entitled to recoup.

The department is therefore entitled to recoup FIP overissuance of \$474.00 from Respondent.

It is SO ORDERED.

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
Vicki L. Armstrong  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 8/2/11

Date Mailed: 8/2/11

**NOTICE:** The law provides that within 60 days of mailing of the above Decision the Respondent may appeal it to the circuit court for the county in which he/she resides or has his or her principal place of business in this state, or in the circuit court for Ingham County. Administrative Hearings, on its own motion, or on request of a party within 60 days of the mailing date of this Hearing Decision, may order a rehearing.

VLA/ds

