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:	201270014 3008 September 25, 2012 Eaton County DHS		
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Christopher S. Saunders				
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 September 25, 2012, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included				
<u>ISSUE</u>				
Did the Department properly \square deny Claimant's application \boxtimes close Claimant's case for:				
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)? ☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)? ☐ Medical Assistance (MA)?		sistance (AMP)? ssistance (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:				
. Claimant ☐ applied for benefits ⊠ received benefits for:				
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP).☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP).☐ Medical Assistance (MA).	State Disability A	ssistance (AMP). Assistance (SDA). ent and Care (CDC).		

2.	On August 1, 2012, the Department		
3.	On August 3, 2012, the Department sent Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the denial. Closure.		
4.	On August 7, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the ☐ denial of the application. ☐ closure of the case.		
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW			
	partment 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 sponsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence ency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, R 400.3101 ough Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program ective October 1, 1996.		
pro im 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 gulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence ency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, R 400.3001 ough 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, et seq., and MCL 0.105.		
	The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is ministered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq.		
for Se pro	The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human rvices (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA ogram pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 2000 AACS, R 400.3151 through Rule 0.3180.		

☐ 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.		
Additionally, at the hearing, the department representative testified that the Claimant's FAP case was closed due to the Claimant not submitting verification of employment with Lea's Lawn Care. However, the Claimant testified that he was never actually employed with Lea's Lawn Care and that he was not able to obtain a working phone number to confirm such. Hand written notes on the Claimant's redetermination paperwork indicate that he did tell the department that he was not in fact employed with the mentioned employer (see Department Exhibit 1, page 5). As the Claimant was never actually employed with Lea's, he cannot be required to verify the lack of such employment. Additionally, the Claimant did in fact try to contact Lea's but was unable to find a working number. Accordingly, this Administrative Law Judge determines that the Claimant has not refused to cooperate with the verification process and as such, that the department improperly terminated his FAP benefits.		
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 denied Claimant's application □ improperly closed Claimant's case 		

for: \square AMP \square FIP \boxtimes FAP \square MA \square SDA \square CDC.

DECISION AND ORDER

of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, finds did act properly.	•			
Accordingly, the Department's \square AMP \square FIP \boxtimes FA is \square AFFIRMED \boxtimes REVERSED for the reasons state				
☑ THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO DO THE F THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND C				
Initiate a redetermination of the Claimant's eligibility for FAP benefits as of the date of negative action (August 1, 2012). If the Claimant is found to be otherwise eligible, the department shall reinstate benefits and, if applicable, issue any past due benefits due and owing that the Claimant is otherwise eligible to receive.				
	/s/			
	Christopher S. Saunders Administrative Law Judge For Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services			
Date Signed: September 27, 2012	Department of Human Services			
Date Mailed: September 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

CSS/cr

