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

#### IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 201218688

Issue No.: 3052

Case No.:

Hearing Date: January 17, 2012

County: Wayne (17)

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 Claim ant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on J anuary 17, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participant s on behalf of Claimant included dealer to the companies of th

#### **ISSUE**

Did the Department pr operly calculate the Department's recoupment from Claimant's Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits?

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based on t he competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

- In a October 13, 2011 H earing Decision, Claimant was found to have com mitted an intentional program violati on (IPV) involving her FAP benefits for the period from September 2005 to December 2007 and was ordered to reimburse the Department for \$4815.
- 2. Claimant denied receiving the notice of the IPV hearing or the Hearing Decision.
- 3. On November 23, 2011, the Department sent Claimant a In tentional Program Violation Client Notice, advis ing Claimant that, as a result of the Hearing Decision, effective January 1, 2012 she was disqualified as a mem ber of her FAP group and her FAP group's monthly allotment was reduced to \$127.
- 4. On December 6, 2011, Claimant filed a request for a hearing.

# **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 established purs uant to the Personal Responsibility and W ork Opportunity Reconc iliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 42 USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly k nown as the Family Independe nce Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3101 t hrough R 400.3131. FI P replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996.
∑ The Food Assistanc e Program (FAP) [fo rmerly known as the Food Sta mp (FS) program] is establis hed by the Food St amp Act of 1977, as amend ed, 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 Independenc e Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001 through R 400.3015.
☐ The Medical Ass istance (MA) program is es tablished by the Title XIX of the Soc ial 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 Independ ence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MC L400.105.
☐ The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is administered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, <i>et seq</i> .
☐ The State Disabilit y Assistance (SDA) progr am, which provides financial ass istance for disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The D epartment of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 2000 AACS, R 400.3 151 through R 400.3180.
☐ The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is establis hed by Titles IVA, IVE and XX of the Soc ial Security Act, the Ch ild Care and Developm ent 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 Fede ral Regulations, Parts 98 and 99. The Depart ment provides servic es to adults and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and Mich Admin Code, R 400.5001 through R 400.5015.

Additionally, at the hearing, Claimant argued that she did no t receive notice of the IPV hearing and did not receive a c opy of the Hearing Decision . However, the Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS) will not grant a rehear ing involving a FAP-IPV. BAM 600. Claimant was advised that an appeal concerning MAHS' finding that she had committed an IPV involving FAP should be brought to the circuit court for the county in

which she resides, as provided in the Hearing Decision and in the Intentional Program Violation Client Notice.

The hearing proceeded with respect to the Department's calculation of Claimant's FAP allotment. BAM 720. A review of Claimant's FAP budget prepared by the Department reveals that the Department calculated the monthly F AP benefit amount and the recoupment amount from the FAP benefits to Claimant's FAP group in accordance with Department policy. BAM 720; BAM 725.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, finds did act properly when it calculated the amount of F entitled to receive following her IPV disqualification and	s that the Department AP benefits Claimant's group was
did not act properly when .	
Accordingly, the Department's ☐ AMP ☐ FIP ☒ FAFIS ☒ AFFIRMED ☐ REVERSED for the reasons state	
	Alice C. Elkin Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: January 24, 2012

Date Mailed: January 24, 2012

**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 ti mely 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
P. O. Box 30639
Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

#### ACE/cl

