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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2012-73568

Issue Nos.: 1003; 3008; 6015

Case No.:

Hearing Date: October 1, 2012 County: Macomb (50-20)

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 Claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on October 1, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included

ISSUE

Did the Department properly ⊠ deny Claima ☑ calculate Claimant's benefits for:	nt's application close Claimant's case	
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)?☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)?☐ Medical Assistance (MA)?	☐ Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)?☐ State Disability Assistance (SDA)?☑ Child Development 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	ed 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). 	

2.	The Department \boxtimes denied Claimant's application \square closed Claimant's case \boxtimes calculated Claimant's benefits.
3.	On August 27, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the \boxtimes denial of the application. \square closure of the case. \boxtimes calculation.
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
	epartment 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 esponsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence lency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, Rule 400.3101 ough Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program ective October 1, 1996.
pro imp 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 egulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence lency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, Rule 0.3001 through 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 lency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MCL 0.105.
☐ ad	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 crvices (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA ogram pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 2000 AACS, Rule 400.3151 through the 400.3180.
an 19	The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE d XX of the Social Security Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 90, and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996.

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.

In the present case, the Department alleges that it decreased Claimant's FAP benefits due to failure to cooperate with regard to child support issues. In addition, Claimant applied for CDC and FIP and was denied due to alleged noncooperation with regard to child support issues. However, Claimant testified credibly that she has been in cooperation with the Office of Child Support. No one from the Office of Child Support was at the hearing to dispute Claimant's testimony.

Without proof of Claimant not cooperating with respect to child support, it is concluded that the Department was not correct in decreasing Claimant's FAP benefits and denying Claimant's FIP and CDC applications.

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 □ properly calculated Claimant's benefits □ improperly closed Claimant's case □ improperly calculated Claimant's benefits 		
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 ightharpoonup did act properly.		
Accordingly, the Department's \square AMP \boxtimes FIP \boxtimes FAP \square MA \square SDA \boxtimes 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 removal of the child support sanction from Claimant's case, engaging the Office of Child Support, if necessary.
- 2. Recalculate Claimant's FAP benefits, May 29, 2012, and ongoing, without the imposition of the child support sanction.
- Issue FAP supplements for any missed or increased payments, in accordance with Department policy.
- 4. Reprocess Claimant's FIP and CDC applications with the effective application date of May 29, 2012, without the imposition of the child support sanction.

5. Issue FIP and CDC supplements, in accordance with Department policy, if Claimant is found to be eligible for FIP and CDC.

Susan C. Burke

Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Jusa C. Bruke

Date Signed: October 5, 2012

Date Mailed: October 5, 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 mailing date 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.

2012-73568/SCB

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

SCB/pf

