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

### IN THE MATTER OF:



| 2012-34062         |
|--------------------|
| 1021; 5032         |
|                    |
| September 20, 2012 |
| Wayne (17)         |
|                    |

# ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Susan C. Burke

# 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 Sept ember 20, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant inclu ded Claim ant. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included FIM.

## ISSUE

Did the Departm ent properly  $\bigotimes$  deny Claiman t's application  $\bigcap$  close Claimant's case for:



Family Independence Program (FIP)? Food Assistance Program (FAP)?

Medical Assistance (MA)?

Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)? State Emergency Relief (SER)? Child Development and Care (CDC)?

# FINDINGS OF FACT

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

1. Cla imant 🛛 applied for benefits 🗌 received benefits for:

| Family Independence Program (FIP). | Adult Medical Assistance (AMP). |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Food Assistance Program (FAP).     | State Emergency Relief (SER)    |
| Medical Assistance (MA).           | Child Development and Care      |
| (CDC).                             |                                 |

- 3. On January 17, 2012 Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the ⊠ denial of the application. □ closure of the case

# CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

# <u>FIP</u>

The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant 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 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.

Department policies are contained in the Br idges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

In the present case, the Department denied Claimant's FIP application due to federal time limits. However, the Department presented no evidence substantiating overcoming the BP 2012-006 directive with respect to suspension of the D epartment's policy on federal time limits. Theref ore, it cannot be determined that the Department acted properly with respect to FIP.

#### <u>SER</u>

The State Emergency Relief (S ER) program is established by 2004 PA 344. The SER program is administered pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq*., and by 1999 AC, Rule 400.7001 through Rule 400.7049. Department polic ies ar e found in the Stat e Emergency Relief Manual (ERM).

In the present case, Claimant testified that her landlord allowed her to stay in the residence at issue until June 1, 2012. ERM 101 states that an applicant must have "an emergency which threatens health or safety and c an be resolved through is suance of SER." Since Claimant's emergency as to s helter was resolved, as an issuance of an SER pay ment would not resolve an em ergency with regar d to Claimant's SER application of December 14, 2011, Claimant's hearin g request of February 1, 2012 i s hereby DISMISSED.

## 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

 $\Box$  did act properly.  $\Box$  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. Initiate reprocessing of Claimant's December 14, 2011 FIP application.
- 2. Issue FIP supplements for any missed or increased payments, December 14, 2011 and ongoing.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that Claimant's request for hearing regarding SER is DISMISSED for reasons stated within the record.

Jusa C. Bruke

Susan C. Burke Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: October 10, 2012

Date Mailed: October 10, 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 order 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 timely request for rehearing was made, within 30 days of the mailing 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

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

#### SCB/ctl

