

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 201275332
Issue No.: 1038
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: October 11, 2012
County: Wayne (31)

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 11, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant and [REDACTED] Claimant's husband and Authorized Hearing Representative (AHR). 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 September 1, 2012, the Department
 denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's case
due to failure to participate in employment-related activities without good cause.
3. On August 18, 2012, the Department sent
 Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)
notice of the denial. closure.
4. On August 24, 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 AACRS, 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, the Department sent Claimant an August 18, 2012, Notice of Case Action notifying her that her FIP case would close effective September 1, 2012 because she and her husband had failed to participate in employment-related activities without good cause. Claimant's FAP case was not affected by the closure of her FIP case.

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. Failing or refusing to comply with assigned activities or participate in employment and/or self-sufficiency-related activities without good cause constitutes a noncompliance with JET required activities justifying closure of a client's FIP case. BEM 233A, pp 1-2. However, JET participants will not be terminated from a JET program and may not have their FIP cases closed without the Department first scheduling a triage meeting with the client to jointly discuss noncompliance and good cause. BEM 233A (May 1, 2012), p 7.

Although the Department testified that both Claimant and her husband were required to participate in the JET program and had been referred to a JET orientation on multiple occasions, in support of its case closing Claimant's FIP case, the Department presented only a July 18, 2012, Work Participation Program Appointment Notice scheduling Claimant's husband's attendance at an August 6, 2012, JET orientation. The Notice was sent to Claimant's address on Prairie. Claimant's spouse testified that they did not receive the Appointment Notice because by that time they had moved to a home on [REDACTED] l. Claimant's husband further testified that he advised the Department of his change of address online. The Department reviewed its system and found that Claimant had reported a change of address from [REDACTED] online on April 14, 2012, which was verified on August 6, 2012. The fact that the Appointment Notice was sent to Claimant at an address where she and her husband no longer resided and they had advised the Department of their change of address prior to the date the notice was sent supports Claimant's husband's testimony that they did not receive the Appointment Notice. Because they did not receive the notice scheduling the JET orientation, the Department did not act in accordance with Department policy when it closed Claimant's FIP case.

It should further be noted that Claimant's husband testified that he and Claimant received the August 18, 2012, Notice of Noncompliance, which was sent to their Hubbell address, and attended the August 29, 2012, triage. Claimants' husband testified that at the triage he presented medical documentation that had not been

previously provided to the Department and considered by the Medical Review Team (MRT) concerning his disability and that Claimant presented medical documentation showing that she was needed to care for her husband. If a client in an ongoing benefit period claims to be disabled or indicates an inability to participate in work or the work participation program, the client should be deferred from employment-related activities while the disability is verified. BEM 230A, pp 10-11. If MRT has found that the client is not disabled but the client states he has additional medical evidence or a new condition, the Department must gather new verifications and send for an updated MRT decision. BEM 230A, p 13. Claimant's testimony establishes that the Department did not act in accordance with Department policy when it failed to consider and process the new medical documentation.

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 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. Remove the FIP sanction imposed on or about September 1, 2012 from Claimant's and her husband's records;
2. Reinstate Claimant's FIP case as of September 1, 2012;
3. Issue supplements for any FIP benefits Claimant was otherwise eligible to receive but did not for September 1, 2012, ongoing;
4. Begin processing, in accordance with Department policy, any medical documentation provided by Claimant and her husband to the Department prior to September 1, 2012; and
5. 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: 10/19/2012

Date Mailed: 10/19/2012

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:

