


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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No: 201277155
Issue No: 1020
Case No: 
Hearing Date: October 31, 2012
Saginaw County DHS

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 upon Claimant's request for a hearing received by the Department of Human Services (department) on August 24, 2012. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on October 31, 2012. Claimant appeared and provided testimony. The department was represented by department personnel.

ISSUE

Whether the Department properly determined Claimant's eligibility for Family Independence Program (FIP) benefits?

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

1. On July 31, 2012, the Claimant applied for FIP benefits.
2. On August 21, 2012, the Department denied the Claimant FIP benefits as the Claimant had reached her State time limit of 48 months.
3. On August 24, 2012, Claimant requested a hearing protesting the department's denial of Claimant's FIP application. (Hearing Request)

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Clients have the right to contest a department decision affecting eligibility for benefit levels whenever it is believed that the decision is incorrect. BAM 600. The department will provide an administrative hearing to review the decision and determine the appropriateness of that decision. BAM 600. The regulations governing the hearing and appeal process for applicants and recipients of public assistance in Michigan are found in the Michigan Administrative Code, M.A.C.R. 400.901-400.951. An opportunity for a hearing shall be granted to an applicant who requests a hearing because her claim for assistance is denied. MAC R 400.903(1)

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 administers the FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3101 through R 400.3131. The FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996. Department policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

The FIP benefit program is not an entitlement. BEM 234. Time limits are essential 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. Effective October 1, 2011, 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 those cases funded by federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funds. Notwithstanding the 48-month lifetime limit for state-funded FIP cases, a family is not eligible to receive FIP assistance beyond 60 consecutive or non-consecutive TANF months. BEM 234. Federally-funded TANF countable months began to accrue for FIP on October 1, 1996. BEM 234.

In this case, the department presented evidence establishing that Claimant had received 48 months of state-funded FIP assistance.

At the hearing, Claimant disagreed with the department's calculation and instead insisted that she had received less than 48 months of state-funded FIP assistance.

Testimony and other evidence must be weighed and considered according to its reasonableness. *Gardiner v Courtright*, 165 Mich 54, 62; 130 NW 322 (1911); *Dep't of Community Health v Risch*, 274 Mich App 365, 372; 733 NW2d 403 (2007). Moreover, the weight and credibility of this evidence is generally for the fact-finder to determine. *Dep't of Community Health*, 274 Mich App at 372; *People v Terry*, 224 Mich App 447, 452; 569 NW2d 641 (1997). In evaluating the credibility and weight to be given the testimony of a witness, the fact-finder may consider the demeanor of the witness, the reasonableness of the witness's testimony, and the interest, if any, the witness may have in the outcome of the matter. *People v Wade*, 303 Mich 303 (1942), *cert den*, 318 US 783 (1943).

I have carefully considered and weighed the testimony and other evidence in the record and find the computer-generated printout[s] provided by the department, establishing the total months in which Claimant received state-funded FIP benefits, to be persuasive. I further find Claimant's disagreement with the department's calculation to be unpersuasive in the absence of any supporting documentation covering the time period in question.

Accordingly, I find that, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence presented during the hearing, the department acted in accordance with policy in denying Claimant's FIP benefits application for the reason that Claimant has reached the 48-month limit of federally-funded FIP assistance and was therefore no longer eligible to receive such assistance.

DECISION

I find, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decide the department acted in accordance with policy in denying Claimant's FIP application because the Claimant has reached the 48-month limit of state-funded FIP assistance. Therefore, the department's denial of Claimant's FIP application is **AFFIRMED**.

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

Date Signed: November 1, 2012

Date Mailed: November 2, 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

CAA/las

cc:



