

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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2012-13259
Issue No.: 3008
Case No.:
Hearing Date: December 19, 2011
County: Wayne (18)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Alice C. Elkin

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 19, 2011, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant, and , Claimant's granddaughter. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included , Family Independence Specialist.

ISSUE

Due to excess income, did the Department properly deny the Claimant's application close Claimant's case reduce Claimant's benefits for:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA)? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA)? | <input type="checkbox"/> 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 for: received benefits for:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP). | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP). |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP). | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA). |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA). | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC). |

2. On December 1, 2011, the Department denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's case reduced Claimant's benefits due to noncooperation with child support.
3. On November 9, 2011, the Department sent Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the denial. closure. reduction.
4. On November 16, 2011, Claimant or Claimant's A HR filed a hearing r equest, protesting the denial of the application. closure of the case. reduction 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 Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is administered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*

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 (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105.

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 2000 AAC, 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, if an individual required to cooperate with obtaining child support fails without good cause to cooperate, that individual is disqualified from the FAP group until the later of one month or when the individual cooperates. BEM 255.

In this case, the Department testified that, based on information on its system indicating that Claimant was in noncompliance with child support, it reduced Claimant's FAP benefits based on her disqualification. At the hearing, the Department was unable to provide any evidence concerning the noncooperation at issue. It did not produce a copy of the Notice of Noncooperation sent to Claimant indicating her noncompliance. It did not know which of Claimant's three grandchildren was the subject of the noncompliance. The Department was given the opportunity to have someone from the Office of Child Support (OCS) participate in the hearing and provided four different telephone numbers, none of which resulted in any contact with an OCS worker. Claimant credibly testified that she was notified of noncompliance with respect to her grandchild [REDACTED], who was 19 years old at the time. [REDACTED] is not a child, and the Department presented no evidence concerning what type of child support noncompliance affected her. Because the Department produced no evidence concerning Claimant's noncooperation with her child support requirements other than its conclusion that its system indicated that Claimant refused to cooperate with child support, the Department did not satisfy its burden of proof in this case to show that it reduced her FAP benefits in accordance with Department policy.

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, due to excess income, the Department properly improperly

- denied Claimant's application
- reduced Claimant's benefits
- closed Claimant's case

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 did act properly did not act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's AMP FIP FAP MA SDA CDC decision is AFFIRMED REVERSED for the reasons stated above and 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. Remove the child's support noncooperation sanction from on or about November 9, 2011, from Claimant's record;
2. Begin recalculating Claimant's FAP benefits, in accordance with Department policy, for December 1, 2011, ongoing to include Claimant as a group member; and
3. Issue supplements for any FAP benefits Claimant was entitled to receive but did not from December 1, 2011, ongoing.



Alice C. Elkin
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: December 28, 2011

Date Mailed: December 28, 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 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 **MAY** 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

2012-13259

ACE/ctl

cc:

[REDACTED]
Wayne County DHS (04)/1843

A.
File

[REDACTED]
Elkin