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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.:	2012-16278
Issue No.:	1038
Case No.:	
Hearing Date:	January 12, 2012
County:	Wayne (82-18)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Jan Leventer

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 January 12, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included

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 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 case
 due to a Department determination that Claimant was in noncompliance with the requirements of the Jobs, Education and Training (JET) program.
- On September 29, 2011, the Department sent
 □ Claimant
 □ Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)
 notice of the
 □ denial.
 □ Closure.
- 4. On December 1, 2011, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the ☐ denial of the application. ⊠ 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 evidence of record establishes that Claimant had transportation problems which constitute good cause, and the Department failed to honor her good cause request. The evidence further establishes that Claimant brought the requested verification of school attendance and/or Job Search Activity Logs to the October 6, 2011, triage but the Department refused to accept them. The evidence further establishes that at some point, the Department advised Claimant to throw away her verification documentation as it was no longer useful.

Claimant gave credible and unrebutted testimony that she had good cause for failure to submit school attendance verification because she did not have transportation to deliver the documents. The second sec

The witness testified that her agency, which is an authorized MichiganWorks! Agency, does not recognize transportation as a type of good cause for failure to comply because they provide transportation for clients to and from their office. However, the witness admitted that this is a service that brings people to the agency for the entire day, and the agency does not provide transportation just for clients to drop off documents during the day.

In addition, the testimony of the witness contradicted Claimant's testimony as well as the Department's Exhibit 2, both of which items of evidence indicated that Claimant was to report every two weeks and not every week. It is found and determined that the Department failed to present sufficient credible evidence to establish that it acted properly in terminating Claimant from receiving FIP benefits.

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 appl
properly closed Claimant's case

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

6				CDC.
IOI T				
		 	00/1	000.

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 i did act properly. i 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. Reinstate Claimant's FIP case;
- 2. Initiate procedures to provide supplemental retroactive and ongoing FIP benefits to Claimant at the benefit level to which she is entitled;
- 3. Initiate procedures to delete all penalties imposed upon Claimant as a result of the Department's action;
- 4. Initiate procedures to re-enroll Claimant in the JET program and permit her to supply all necessary school verification and Job Search Activity Logs required by that program.
- 5. All steps shall be taken in accordance with Department policy and procedure.

Jan One.

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

Date Signed: January 18, 2012

Date Mailed: January 18, 2012

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 <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 at

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

JL/pf

CC: Ŀ