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

#### IN THE MATTER OF:





#### ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Suzanne Morris

## **HEARING DECISION**

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MC	CL 400.9
and MCL 400.37 following Claima <u>nt's request for a hearing. After due r</u>	notice, a
telephone hearing was held on	
Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claim <u>ant. Participants on b</u>	ehalf of
Department of Human Services (Department) included	

## ISSUES

Did the Department properly 🗌 deny	Claimant's	application [	close	Claimant's	case
reduce Claimant's benefits for:					

	Family	Indepe	endence	Program
~			_	

State Disability Assistance (SDA)?

(FIP)? Food Assistance Program (FAP)?

Medical Assistance (MA)?

Child Development and Care (CDC)?

Di	d the Department properly 🛛 d	leny	<b>Claimant's</b>	application	close	Claimant's	case
	reduce Claimant's benefits for:						

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

Medical Assistance (MA)?

Ctata Diaghility Assistance (CDA)2
State Disability Assistance (SDA)?

Child Development and Care (CDC)?

## FINDINGS OF FACT

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

- 1. Claimant applied for was receiving: FIP KAP MA SDA CDC.
- 2. Claimant 🛛 applied for 🗌 was receiving: 🗌 FIP 🔤 FAP 🖾 MA 🔤 SDA 🖾 CDC.
- 3. Claimant began employment and receiving income.

4. The Department

denied Claimant's application

closed Claimant's case

 $\boxtimes$  reduced Claimant's FAP benefits

due to increased earnings.

5. The Department

 $\boxtimes$  denied Claimant's MA and CDC application.

closed Claimant's case

reduced Claimant's

On contract of the contract of t

reduction of Claimant's benefits.

7. On  $\square$ , Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the  $\square$  denial.  $\square$  closure.  $\square$  reduction.

# CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Department policies are found 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, R 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, R 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 (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105.

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program which provides financial assistance for disabled persons is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 2000 AACS, R 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, R 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.

The claimant testified that she did not dispute the closure of her FIP case due to excess income, as she did begin working. The claimant testified that she disputed her FAP because the department did not add her daughter into the program group, the CDC because she did turn in her provider information and the MA because they did not process her case for a deductible. The department representative stipulated that the department did not process the claimant's case properly. The department stipulated to reprocess the claimant's CDC and MA application and add the claimant's daughter into the FAP group back to the date of application, pending any verification of school enrollment.

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 improperly

closed Claimant's case.

 $\boxtimes$  denied Claimant's application.

reduced Claimant's benefits.

# 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 i did act properly. i did not act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's decision is  $\Box$  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. The department will initiate reprocessing the claimant's CDC application.
- 2. The department will initiate reprocessing the claimant's MA application, considering the claimant for a deductible case if excess income for full MA.

3. The department will initiate adding the claimant's daughter into the FAP group back to the date of application, pending any school verification necessary, and issue the claimant any retroactive FAP benefits she is due.

#### SO ORDERED.

/s/\_\_\_\_\_

Suzanne L. Morris Administrative Law Judge For Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed:	
Date Mailed:	

**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 receipt 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 <u>MAY</u> 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

