

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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 201270300
Issue No.: 1038
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: October 15, 2012
County: Wayne (35)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Alice C. Elkin

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 October 15, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED], Family Independence Specialist.

ISSUE

Did the Department properly deny Claimant's application close Claimant's case for:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA)? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC)? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Direct Support Services (DSS)? | |

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:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP). | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP). |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP). | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA). |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA). | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC). |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Direct Support Services (DSS). | |

2. On August 7, 2012, the Department
 denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's case
due to failure to attend and participate in the Jobs, Education and Training program
prior to her case opening .
3. On August 7, 2012, the Department sent
 Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)
notice of the denial. closure.
4. On August 13, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the
 denial of the application. closure of the case.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

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

The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is administered 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, 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.

Direct Support Services (DSS) is administered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.57a, et. seq., and Mich Admin Code R 400.3603.

Additionally, in order to increase their employability and obtain employment, work eligible individuals (WEIs) seeking FIP are required to participate in the Jobs, Education and Training (JET) Program or other employment-related activity unless temporarily deferred or engaged in activities that meet participation requirements. BEM 230A (December 1, 2011), p 1; BEM 233A (May 1, 2012), p 1. Work participation program engagement is a condition of FIP eligibility. BEM 229 (December 1, 2011), p 5. While the FIP application is pending, clients must engage in and comply with all work participation program assignments. BEM 229, pp 3, 5. An applicant who fails or refuses to appear and participate with the JET program or other employment service provider without good cause is noncompliant. BEM 233A, pp 1-2. Failure by a client to participate fully in assigned activities while the FIP application is pending will result in denial of FIP benefits. BEM 229, p 5; BEM 233A, p 5. A good cause hearing is not required for applicants who are non-compliant prior to the FIP case opening. BEM 233A, p 7.

In this case, Claimant applied for FIP benefits in connection with the TC-60 settlement and her application was dated February 29, 2012. On July 9, 2012, the Department sent Claimant a Work Participation Program Appointment Notice notifying her that she was required to attend the JET orientation on July 23, 2012. Claimant did not attend the orientation and the Department sent her an August 7, 2012 Notice of Case Action denying her FIP application.

At the hearing, Claimant testified that she did not attend the July 23, 2012 orientation because she did not receive the Notice. However, she testified, and the Department confirmed, that she received *another* Appointment Notice dated August 2, 2012, requiring her to attend a JET orientation on August 13, 2012. The Department noted that Claimant also failed to attend this orientation and that her case would not have closed had she attended this orientation. At the hearing, Claimant credibly testified that she intended to attend the August 13, 2012 orientation but, before she could do so, she received the August 7, 2012, Notice of Case Action denying her JET application for failure to participate in employment-related activities.

The Department has the responsibility to protect client's rights and explain client responsibilities in understandable terms. BAM 105 (September 1, 2012), p 8. Because her FIP application was denied, Claimant testified that she concluded that her

attendance at the August 13, 2012, would have no effect. By sending Claimant an August 7, 2012, Notice of Case Action denying her FIP application after sending her an Appointment Notice sending her to a JET orientation on August 13, 2012, and testifying that Claimant's application would not have been denied had Claimant attended this second JET orientation, the Department failed to explain Claimant's responsibilities in understandable terms. As a result, under the facts in this case, the Department did not act in accordance with Department policy when it denied Claimant's FIP application.

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
 properly closed Claimant's case improperly closed Claimant's case

for: AMP FIP FAP MA SDA CDC DSS.

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 DSS
decision is AFFIRMED REVERSED for the reasons stated above and 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. Reinstate Claimant's FIP application dated to February 29, 2012;
2. Begin processing the application in accordance with Department policy;
3. Issue supplements to Claimant for any FIP benefits she is eligible to receive but did not from March 16, 2012, ongoing; and
4. Notify Claimant in writing of its decision in accordance with Department policy.



Alice C. Elkin
Administrative Law Judge
For Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 10/24/2012

Date Mailed: 10/24/2012

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 **MAY** 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

ACE/hw

cc:

