

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**



Reg. No.: 20123043  
Issue No.: 1038  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: December 22, 2011  
County: Wayne County DHS (49)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Andrea J. Bradley

**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 22, 2011, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant, [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED], JET Case Manager, and [REDACTED].

**ISSUE**

Did the Department properly  deny Claimant's application  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  received benefits for:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA).           | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC).  |

2. On October 1, 2011, the Department  
 denied Claimant's application       reduced Claimant's benefits  
due to failure to cooperate with Jobs, Education, and Training (JET) requirements.
3. On November 23, 2011, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the  
 denial of the application.       reduction of FAP benefits.

### **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 Department requires clients to participate in employment and self-sufficiency related activities and to accept employment when offered. BEM 233A. All Work Eligible Individuals (“WEI”) are required to participate in the development of a Family Self-Sufficiency Plan (“FSSP”) unless good cause exists. BEM 228 As a condition of eligibility, all WEIs must engage in employment and/or self-sufficiency related activities. BEM 233A The WEI is considered non-compliant for failing or refusing to appear and participate with the Jobs, Education, and Training Program (JET) or other employment service provider. BEM 233A Good cause is a valid reason for noncompliance with employment and/or self-sufficiency related activities that are based on factors that are beyond the control of the noncompliant person. BEM 233A Failure to comply without good cause results in FIP closure. BEM 233A.

In this case, the Claimant was sanctioned for failing to provide check stubs timely to provide proof of her employment. The Claimant presented credible and un rebutted evidence that she contacted the Department and JET Program Coordinator to notify them of her employment. She further testified that she was advised to submit her check stubs once she had received two checks. The Claimant timely reported to the Department and attempted to report to the JET Program Coordinator, however, her case was already in triage.

The Department was unable to submit sufficient testimony as to the noncompliance in this case, and was initially unaware of the reason why the Claimant's benefits were reduced effective October 1, 2011. Moreover, the testimony given by the Department supported the Claimant's statements that she was advised to report to JET with the check stubs once she had received two checks. Finally, there was insufficient evidence presented to show that the Claimant was advised of a triage in this matter. Therefore, the Department failed to act in accordance with Department policy when it reduced the Claimant's FAP benefits based on a JET sanction.

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

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> properly denied Claimant's application | <input type="checkbox"/> improperly denied Claimant's application          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> properly closed Claimant's case        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> improperly reduced Claimant's benefits |

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 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. The Department shall remove the October 1, 2011 negative action and begin to reinstate the Claimant's benefits in accordance with Department policy.
2. The Department shall supplement the Claimant for lost benefits she was eligible and otherwise qualified to receive but-for the October 1, 2011 negative case action.

  
Andrea J. Bradley  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: January 13, 2012

Date Mailed: January 13, 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 **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

AJB/hw

cc:

