

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2012 25179  
Issue No.: 3008  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: February 15, 2012  
County: Wayne County DHS (19)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Lynn M. Ferris

**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 February 15, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED], ES, and [REDACTED] Assistance Payments Supervisor.

**ISSUE**

Due to a failure to comply with the verification requirements, did the Department properly  deny Claimant's application  close Claimant's case  reduce Claimant's benefits for:

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

**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  FAP  MA  SDA  CDC.
2. The Department mailed the Claimant a redetermination packet and scheduled a telephone interview for November 3, 2010 at 2PM. The redetermination packet was due on November 3, 2011. Exhibit 3.

3. The Claimant filed her redetermination information with the Department on November 1, 2010. Exhibit 6.
4. The Claimant attempted to reschedule her telephone interview when she did not receive a call from her caseworker on November 3, 2010. The Claimant also went to the DHS offices on that date attempting to reach her case worker. Exhibits 5 and 7.
5. The Claimant called her case worker on several occasions attempting to reschedule her interview. The Claimant sent her caseworker a Quick Note on November 15, 2010 indicating that she was having difficulty reaching her worker and listed times when she would be available.
6. The Claimant's case worker attempted to contact her on several occasions by phone during work hours. Exhibit 3.
7. On November 30, 2010, the Department
  - denied Claimant's application
  - closed Claimant's case
  - reduced Claimant's benefitsfor failure to complete the redetermination interview.
8. On November 30, 2010 , the Department sent notice of the
  - denial of Claimant's application.
  - closure of Claimant's case.
  - reduction of Claimant's benefits.
9. On February 14, 2011 the Claimant filed a timely hearing request, protesting the
  - denial.  closure.  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 1997 AACRS R 400.3101-3131. 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 1997 AACS R 400.3001-3015

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 1998-2000 AACS R 400.3151-400.3180.

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 1997 AACS R 400.5001-5015.

Additionally, the Department closed the Claimant's FAP case when the Claimant's redetermination telephone interview was not rescheduled. The Claimant filed her redetermination paperwork before the telephone interview and was available on the date of the interview and had taken off work. The Claimant's caseworker did receive the paperwork the day of the interview but did not conduct the interview. This is a case where both sides attempted to communicate with each other but the attempts were unsuccessful. The Claimant credibly testified that she provided the Department the redetermination information well in advance of the interview and confirmed that she filed it by providing a copy of the Department sign in log, which she signed and copied. Under these circumstances the interview should have occurred as scheduled for November 3, 2010 but did not. Thereafter a true case of phone tag occurred with each party attempting to contact the other. The Claimant also advised her worker before the case closure the best times to reach her was -when she would not be at work. Exhibit 9.

Under these circumstances, it must be found that there was no refusal to cooperate, as the Claimant did everything she was supposed to do. While the Department caseworker is to be commended for attempting to reach the Claimant on several occasions, the times of telephone contact were while the Claimant was at work and not available. Under these circumstances it is found that the Claimant did not refuse to cooperate, and thus the Department improperly closed the Claimant's FAP case. BAM 130.

Based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, and in this decision, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department

properly       improperly

- closed Claimant's case.
- 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

did act properly.       did not act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's decision is  AFFIRMED  REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record and as setforth in this Decision.

THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO DO THE FOLLOWING WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER:

1. The Department shall initiate reinstatement of the Claimant's FAP case retroactive to November 30, 2010 and process the redetermination in accordance with Department policy and determine eligibility of the Claimant for FAP benefits as of that date.
2. The Department shall issue a supplement to the Claimant for any FAP benefits she was otherwise entitled to receive in accordance with Department policy.



Lynn M. Ferris  
Administrative Law Judge  
For Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: February 21, 2012

Date Mailed: February 21, 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 to:

Michigan Administrative hearings  
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request  
P. O. Box 30639  
Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

LMF/hw

cc:

