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

IN THE MATTER OF:				
	Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	2012-65824 3009 August 22, 2012 SSPC-East (97-98)		
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Jan Leventer				
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 August 22, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant and his Authorized Representative, Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included				
<u>ISSUE</u>				
Did the Department properly \boxtimes deny Claimant's application \square close Claimant's case for:				
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)? ☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)? ☐ Medical Assistance (MA)? ☐		ssistance (AMP)? Assistance (SDA)? ent 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). 	☐ Adult Medical Assistance (AMP). ☐ State Disability Assistance (SDA). ☐ Child Development and Care (CDC).	

 On June 20, 2012, the Department	tion of
 On June 20, 2012, the Department sent ☐ Claimant ☐ Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the ☐ denial. ☐ closure. 	
 On July 27, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the	
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW	
Department policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAN Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).	√I), the
☐ The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Perence Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 10, 42 USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, Rule 40 through Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) prefective October 1, 1996.	04-193, ndence 0.3101
∑ The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stam program] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, implemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Regulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC 400.3001 through Rule 400.3015.	and is ederal ndence
☐ The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Indeper Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 400.105.	(CFR). ndence
☐ The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, administered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, <i>et seq.</i>	and is
☐ The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assifor disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of I Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 2000 AACS, Rule 400.3151 to Rule 400.3180.	Human e SDA

☐ 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's BEM 203, "Criminal Justice Disqualifications," states that a person who has been convicted of a felony for the use, possession or distribution of controlled substances is disqualified if their terms of probation or parole are violated, and if the conviction occurred after August 22, 1996. BEM 203 (2011), p. 2. Claimant's criminal history record from the State of Michigan Offender Tracking Information System, July 20, 2012, demonstrates that Claimant has a drug-related felony conviction, and that he violated the terms of his probation. Accordingly, the Department's action in this case is affirmed.				
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 □ properly closed Claimant's case □ improperly closed Claimant's case				
for:				
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.				
Jan Leventer Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director				
Department of Human Services Date Signed: August 27, 2012				
Date Mailed: August 27, 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.

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

JL/pf

