

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 201247589
Issue No.: 3052, 4060
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: May 23, 2012
County: Genesee County DHS #6

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Corey A. Arendt

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 May 23, 2012 from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED].

ISSUE

Did Claimant receive an overissuance of program benefits that the Department is entitled to recoup?

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

1. During the period of May 2011 and August 2011 through January 2012, the Claimant received benefits for the Family Independence Program (FIP). During the period of May 2011 and August 2011 through December 2011, the Claimant received benefits for the Food Assistance Program (FAP).
2. The Department determined that Claimant received a FIP overissuance in the amount of [REDACTED] during the time period of May 2011 and August 2011 through January 2012.
3. The Department determined the Claimant received a FAP over issuance in the amount of [REDACTED] during the time period of May 2011 and August 2011 through December 2011.

4. The over issuance was due to Department error. client error.
5. On March 29, 2012, the Department sent four separate notices of over issuance and repayment agreements to Claimant.
6. On April 18, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the Department's recoupment action.

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 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.

Departmental policy, states that when the client group receives more benefits than the group is entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the OI. Repayment of an OI is the responsibility of anyone who was an eligible, disqualified, or other adult in the program group at the time the OI occurred. Bridges will collect from all adults who were a member of the case. OIs on active programs are repaid by lump sum cash payments, monthly cash payments (when court ordered), and administrative recoupment (benefit reduction). OI balances on inactive cases must be repaid by lump sum or monthly cash payments unless collection is suspended. BAM 725.

The Department admitted they did not follow their own policies in budgeting Respondent's income. I have reviewed the Department's exhibits and have concluded the Department failed to use the appropriate income resulting in an OI of benefits to Respondent. **Regardless of fault, the Department must attempt to recoup the OI.**

I find the evidence presented by the Department shows the Respondent received more benefits than she was entitled to receive. Therefore, Respondent is responsible for repayment of the OI.

DECISION AND ORDER

I find, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decide the Respondent received an OI of FAP and FIP benefits. The Department is entitled to recoup the OI.

The Department is therefore entitled to recoup from the Respondent a FAP OI of [REDACTED] and a FIP OI of [REDACTED]

The Department shall initiate collection procedures in accordance with Department policy.

/s/ _____
Corey A. Arendt
Administrative Law Judge
For Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: May 24, 2012

Date Mailed: May 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.

201247589/CAA

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

CAA/cr

cc:

