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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.:20127922Issue No.:1080Case No.:Image: Case No.:Hearing Date:November 29, 2011County:Wayne

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Susanne E. Harris

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 following Claim ant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on November 29, 2011, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included t he Claimant. Participants o n behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included

ISSUE

Did the Department properly cl ose Claimant's case for Family Independence Program (FIP) benefits?

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based on t he competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

- 1. Claimant was an ongoing recipient of FIP benefits.
- 2. On October 27, 2011, the Department notified Claimant that Claimant's FIP case would close effective **October 1, 2011**, because Claimant exceeded the lifetime limit on the receipt of FIP assistance.
- On October 20, 2011, Claimant filed a Req uest for Hearing, disputing the Department's action on the basis that the Department
 M miscalculated the number of months Claimant had received FIP benefits.
 Improperly determined Claimant's group composition.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and W ork Opportunity Reconc iliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 42 USC 601, *et seq*. The Department (formerly k nown as the Family Independence Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq*., and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3101 t hrough R 400.3131. FI P replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996. Departm ent policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Referenc e Tables Manual (RFT).

FIP is not an entitlement. BEM 234. Time limits are e ssential to establishing the temporary nature of aid as well as communicating the FIP philosophy to support a family's movement to self-sufficiency. BEM 234. BEM 234 restricts the total cumulative months that an individual may receive FIP benefits to a lifetime limit of 48 months for state-funded FIP cases and 60 months for federally-funded FIP cases.

Additionally, the claimant test ified that she did not receive at least 60 months of federal FIP benefits, however, the Department's Bridges print out is c onvincing evidence to the contrary and found to be reliable and competent evidence.

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 indicate the property indicate the property indicates the property indicates of the property indicates the proper

Accordingly, the Department's decision is AFFIRMED REVERSED for the reasons stated above and on the record.

Susanne E Hanis

Susanne E. Harris Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: November 30, 2011

Date Mailed: November 30, 2011

NOTICE: Michigan Administrative Hearing S ystem (MAHS) may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a par ty within 30 days of the mailing date of this Dec ision and Order . MAHS will not order a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's mo tion where the final decis ion 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

Re consideration/Rehearing Request

P. O. Box 30639 Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

SEH/cl

