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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.:	20
Issue No.:	10
Case No.:	
Hearing Date:	De
County:	W

201210894 1038

December 8, 2011 Wayne County DHS (55)

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 8, 2011, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant, and her witness, and her witness, Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included , Family Independence Manager, and the services (Department), Family Independence Specialist.

ISSUE

Did the Department properly 🖾 deny Claimant's application 🗌 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 \boxtimes applied for benefits \square 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. The Claimant was scheduled to attend the Jobs, Education, and Training (JET) Work First Program on July 27, 2011.
- 3. The Claimant arrived late for the JET appointment and was told by Work First that she would have to schedule her JET orientation through the Department.
- 4. On July 27, 2011, the Claimant contacted the Department and left a message requesting a re-scheduled appointment for the JET Work First Program.
- On July 30, 2011, the Department
 ☑ denied Claimant's application
 ☑ closed Claimant's case
 due to failure to attend the JET Work First Program on July 27, 2011.
- On July 30, 2011, the Department sent
 ☐ Claimant ☐ Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the ☐ denial. ☐ closure.
- 7. 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 applicable Department policy states that failure by a client to participate fully in assigned activities while the FIP application is pending will result in denial of FIP benefits. BEM 229. The Claimant, in this case, testified credibly that she appeared for her scheduled JET appointment, however, she appeared late. The Claimant further testified that she was turned away by the JET Work First Program coordinator and told to reschedule her appointment through the Department. The Department testified that when these circumstances occur, the Department typically will reschedule the JET apppointment, provided the Claimant contacts the Department to request a new date. The Claimant offered credible testimony that she contacted the Department immediately after having been turned away from JET to request a new orientation date. The Claimant tried to participate fully, but she was turned away from the JET Work First Program and the Department did not return the Claimant's phone calls on the issue of rescheduling the JET appointment. According to BAM 105, the Department must protect the client's rights. The Department failed to protect the client's rights when it failed to return the Claimant's phone call and reschedule the JET appointment prior to denying the application. Accordingly, the Department failed to act in accordance with Department policy when it denied the Claimant's June 27, 2011 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

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

for:		🛛 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

 \Box did act properly. \Box 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 the Claimant's June 27, 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 based on the June 27, 2011 application in accordance with Department policy.

Andrea J. Bradle

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

Date Signed: <u>12/19/11</u>

Date Mailed: <u>12/19/11</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

2012-10894/AJB

P. O. Box 30639 Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

AJB/hw

