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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2012-31424 Issue Nos.: 1038, 3000 Case No.:

Hearing Date: May 24, 2012 County: Wayne (82-35)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Jonathan W. Owens

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, an inperson hearing was held on May 24, 2012, from Redford, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant and Claimant and Claimant's friend. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included

ISSUE

Whether the Department properly determined the Claimant was in non-compliance with Work First and closed Claimant's Family Independence Program (FIP) and Food Assistance Program (FAP) cases?

ISSUE

Did the Department properly deny Clair for:	mant's application 🗵 close Claimant's case
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)?	☐ Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)?
Food Assistance Program (FAP)?	☐ State Disability Assistance (SDA)?
Medical Assistance (MA)?	☐ 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). ☐ Child Development and Care (CDC).
2.	On January 4, 2012, Claimant was sent a Triage notice.
3.	On January 12, 2012, Claimant was scheduled to attend a Triage to determine good cause. Claimant failed to appear for the Triage.
4.	On January 13, 2012, the Department issued a case closure notice for the Claimant's FIP benefits. No action was taken on Claimant's FAP case.
5.	On January 23, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the denial of the application. \boxtimes closure of the case.
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
	epartment policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the dges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).
Re 42 Ag thr	The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal esponsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence lency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, Rule 400.3101 ough Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program ective October 1, 1996.
pro imp Re Ag	The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) ogram] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is plemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal egulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence lency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, Rule 0.3001 through Rule 400.3015.
Se Th Ag	The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social curity Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). e Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence ency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, <i>et seq.</i> , and MCL 0.105.
□ ad	The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is ministered 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.
On January 4, 2012, Claimant was sent a notice of noncompliance. This notice informed Claimant a Triage was scheduled for January 12, 2012, at 9:00 a.m. Claimant failed to appear for the Triage. The Department made a good cause determination and found no good cause existed for Claimant's failure to participate. Claimant asserts she was, essentially, homeless during the timeframe in question. Claimant, however, never informed the Department of her situation. Claimant and her witness both assert contact was made prior to the Triage. However, the testimony given by Claimant was conflicting as to when she contacted the Department and when she received the notice of Triage. Claimant's witness at the hearing was also listed on the Department records as her abuser. However, during the hearing, it was disclosed that Claimant herself was the alleged abuser and not her witness.
Claimant's witness presented a copy of the personal protection order (PPO). This order, in fact, lists Claimant as the alleged abuser. It was also noted during the hearing that the PPO was still active and is to remain in place until November 2012.
In this case, Claimant is responsible for maintaining contact with the Department and disclosing any address changes. Claimant failed to report her living arrangement change to the Department. The Department properly sent a notice of noncompliance to the address on file. Claimant was still using the address as her mailing address according to her testimony. This Administrative Law Judge found both the testimony of Claimant and her witness to be less than credible and, at best, conflicting regarding the receipt of the notice and subsequent alleged attempts to contact the Department.
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 application □ improperly denied Claimant's application □ improperly 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 \infty \text{did act properly.} \infty \text{did not act properly.}
Accordingly, the Department's \square AMP \boxtimes FIP \square FAP \square MA \square SDA \square CDC decision is \boxtimes AFFIRMED \square REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.
Claimant, at hearing, indicated she no longer wished to have a hearing regarding her FAP case. Claimant indicated, and the Department confirmed, no action had been taken on Claimant's FAP case. Therefore, the issue regarding her FAP case is
Jonathan W. Owens
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services
Department of Flaman Corvious

Date Signed: May 29, 2012

Date Mailed: May 29, 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:
 - 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.

2012-31424/JWO

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

JWO/pf

