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

IN	ıΤ		NA /	<b>\T</b>	ΓER	$\circ$	┏.
ш		пс	IVI	<b>1</b> I		Ü	Г.



Reg. No.: 201228148 Issue No.: 1000, 6000

Case No.:

Hearing Date: March 7, 2012 County: Wayne DHS (55)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Christian Gardocki

### SETTLEMENT ORDER

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 March 7, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the above named claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included

## <u>ISSUE</u>

whether the Department properly:	
□ denied Claimant's application for benefits     □ closed Claimant's case for benefits     □ reduced Claimant's benefits	
for:	
<ul> <li>☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)?</li> <li>☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)?</li> <li>☐ Medical Assistance (MA)?</li> <li>☐ Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)?</li> </ul>	☐ State Disability Assistance (SDA)?  ☐ Child Development and Care (CDC)? ☐ State Emergency Services (SER)?

# FINDINGS OF FACT

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

1. On 12/12/11, the Department:

	<ul> <li>☑ denied Claimant's application for benefits</li> <li>☐ closed Claimant's case for benefits</li> <li>☐ reduced Claimant's benefits</li> </ul>				
	under the following program(s):				
2.	On 12/12/11, the Department sent notice to Claimant (or Claimant's Authorized Hearing Representative) of the:				
	<ul><li>☑ denial</li><li>☐ closure</li><li>☐ reduction.</li></ul>				
3.	On 1/5/12, Claimant filed a request for hearing concerning the Department's action.				
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW					
Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), the Reference Tables Manual (RFT), and the State Emergency Relief Manual (ERM).					
∑ 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 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.					

The law provides that disposition may be made of a contested case by stipulation or agreed settlement. MCL 24.278(2).

In the present case, Claimant requested a hearing to dispute a denial of a CDC and FIP benefit application dated 10/27/11. Soon after commencement of the hearing, the parties testified that they had reached a settlement concerning the disputed action. The Department agreed to: reinstate Claimant's application dated 10/27/11 for FIP and CDC

benefits, process Claimant's eligibility for FIP and CDC and supplement Claimant accordingly.

As a result of this settlement, Claimant no longer wishes to proceed with the hearing. As such, it is unnecessary for this Administrative Law Judge to render a decision regarding the facts and issues in this case.

# **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department and Claimant have come to a settlement regarding Claimant's request for a hearing.

## THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO DO THE FOLLOWING:

- 1. reinstate Claimant's application dated 10/27/11 for FIP and CDC benefits;
- 2. process Claimant's eligibility for FIP and CDC; and
- 3. supplement Claimant for any benefits not received as a result of the improper application denial.

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

Christin Dordock

Date Signed: March 12, 2012

Date Mailed: March 12, 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 **MAY** be granted for any of the following reasons:

### 201228148/CG

- 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 to:

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

### CG / hw

