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

IN THE MATTER OF:



 Reg. No.:
 2012-12989

 Issue No.:
 3008

 Case No.:
 Issue March 1, 2012

 Hearing Date:
 March 1, 2012

 County:
 Wayne (15)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Susan C. Burke

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 following Claim ant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on Ma rch 1, 2012 from Detroit, Mich igan. Participants on behalf of Claimant inc luded Claimant. Part icipants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included

ISSUE

Did the Department properly close Claimant's case under the

	Х	
i		

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 t he competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. Cla imant 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).

- On November 1, 2011, the Department

 denied Claimant's application
 closed Claimant's benefits due to non-cooperation in child support matters..
- On October 10, 2011, the Department sent
 □ Claimant □ Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) □ denial. □ closure.
- 4. On October 18, 2011, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the ☐ denial of the application. ⊠ closure of benefits.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Department policies are contained in the Br idges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

The Family Independence program (FIP) was es tablished pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconc iliation Act of 1996, P ublic Law 104-193, 8 USC 601, *et seq.* T he Department administers the FIP progr am pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MAC R 400.3101-3131.

Clients must comply with all requests for ac tion or information needed t o establish paternity and/or obtain chil d support on behalf of children for whom they receive assistance, unless a claim of good cause for not cooperating has been granted or is pending. Failure to cooperate e without good cause result s in dis qualification. Disqualification includes member removal, denial of program benef its, and/or case closure, depending on the program. BEM 255.

BEM 255, p. 7 instructs:

Cooperation is required in all phases of the process to establish paternity and obtain support. It includes **all** of the following:

- Contacting the support specialist when requested.
- Providing all known information about the absent parent.

• Appearing at the office of the prosecuting attorney when requested.

• Taking any actions needed to establish paternity and obtain child support (including but not limited to testifying at hearings or obtaining blood tests).

Regulations governing the Office of Child Support (OCS) can be found in the IV-D Manual (4DM).

Non-cooperation exists when a client, without good cause, willfully and repeatedly fails or refuses to provide information and/or take an action resulting in delays or prevention of support action. 4DM 115.

Before finding a client non- cooperative, the Suppor t Spec ialist must establis h and document that the client failed and/or refused to provide known or obtainable information and/or to take an action without an acceptable reason or excuse. 4DM 115. The goal of the cooperation requirement is to obtain support. Support specialists should find non-c ooperation only as a last reso rt. There is no minimum information requirement. 4DM 115.

Several factors may affect a client's abi lity to remember or obtain info rmation. In evaluating cooperation, the Support Specialist should consid er such factors as client's marital status, duration of relationship and length of time since last contact with the non-custodial parent. A client who was married to the non-cu stodial parent or knew the putative father for several months can reasonably be expected to provide identifying and location information. The extent and age of location information obtainable may be affected by how long it has been since the parties last lived together or had personal contact. 4DM 115.

In the present case, the Department did not call a witness at the hearing from the Office of Child Support. The Claiman t testified credibly that s he believed all matters with regard to child support had been resolved, t hat she contacted the Office of Child Support in October of 2011 prior to the closure. Without detailed proof of noncooperation, this Administrative Law Judge cannot find that Claimant failed to cooperate with respect to child support. Therefore, the Department was incorrect in closing Claimant's FIP case.

Based upon the abov e Findings of Fact and Co nclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department

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

improperly denied Claimant's application improperly closed Claimant's benefits

for: \square AMP \boxtimes FIP \square FAP \square MA \square SDA \square 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 idid act properly. idid 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:

2012-12989/SCB

- 1. Initiate removal of the chld support sanction on Claim ant's FIP case, engag ing the Office of Child Support if necessary.
- 2. Initate reinstatement of Claimant's FIP case, effective November 1, 2011, if Claimant is otherwise eligible for FIP.
- 3. Initiate issuance of FIP supplements, November 1, 2011 and ongoing, if Claimant is otherwise eligible for FIP.

C. Buch

Susan C. Burke Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: <u>3/7/12</u>

Date Mailed: <u>3/7/12</u>

NOTICE: Michigan Administrative Hearing Syst em (MAHS) may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a par ty within 30 days of the mailing date of this Dec ision and Order . MAHS will not or der a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's mo tion where the final decis ion 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 Re consideration/Rehearing Request

Re consideration/Rehearing Reques P. O. Box 30639 Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

SCB/sm

