

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2012-77715
Issue Nos.: 1080, 6019
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: March 21, 2013
County: Wayne (82-49)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Michael J. Bennane

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon the Claimant's request for a hearing received by the Department of Human Services (Department) on August 28, 2012. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on March 21, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of the Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department included [REDACTED].

ISSUE

Whether the Department properly determined that the Claimant has exceeded the lifetime limit on 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. Claimant was an ongoing recipient of FIP.
2. On May 1, 2012, the Department determined that Claimant is not eligible for FIP benefits after exceeding the lifetime limit on the receipt of state-funded FIP assistance.
3. On August 4, 2012, the Department notified Claimant of the closure.
4. On August 8, 2012, the Department received Claimant's Request for Hearing, disputing the Department's action on the basis that the Department had

incorrectly counted the number of months that she had received FIP and had not properly provided CDC benefits.

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. The Department Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 600 (February 1, 2013). 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 (Mich Admin Code), R 400.901-400.951. An opportunity for a hearing shall be granted to an applicant who requests a hearing because the claim for assistance is denied. Mich Admin Code, R 400.903(1).

FIP Benefits

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

The FIP benefit program is not an entitlement. BEM 234 (January 1, 2013). 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 for which no months were exempt.

The 48-month lifetime limit for state-funded FIP cases allows exemption months in which an individual does not receive a count towards the individual's 48-month lifetime limit. BEM 234. Exemption months are months the individual is deferred from Partnership.Accountability.Training.Hope. (PATH) for: (i) domestic violence; (ii) being 65 years of age or older; (iii) a verified disability of long-term incapacity lasting longer than 90 days; or (iv) a spouse or parent who provides care for a spouse or child with verified disabilities living in the home. BEM 234.

Once an individual reaches a FIP time limit and the FIP closes, the individual is not eligible for FIP if the individual reapplies and meets an exemption criteria based on the funding source. BEM 234.

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).

In this case, the Department did not present sufficient credible testimony and documentary evidence at the hearing establishing that Claimant had received at least 48 months of state-funded assistance.

This Administrative Law Judge has carefully considered and weighed the testimony and other evidence in the record and finds the Department has not met its burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that the Claimant has reached or exceeded the lifetime limit of 48 months for state-funded FIP cases.

Accordingly, the Administrative Law Judge finds that, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence presented during the hearing, the Department failed to present sufficient evidence to meet its burden of proof.

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 closed Claimant's FIP case. improperly closed Claimant's FIP case.

CDC Benefits

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, Rule 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.

Claimant stated at the beginning of the hearing that the problem with her CDC benefits had been resolved. Therefore, no action need be taken on this issue and this portion of the hearing request is DISMISSED.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the Department

did act properly.

did not act properly, when it determined that the Claimant has reached the 48-month lifetime limit of state-funded FIP assistance.

Accordingly, the Department's FIP eligibility determination 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. Initiate reinstatement of Claimant's FIP benefits back to its closure on May 1, 2012, and supplement for any missed benefits.

Claimant's request for hearing on CDC benefits is, hereby, DISMISSED.



Michael J. Bennane
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: May 9, 2013

Date Mailed: May 14, 2013

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 affect the substantial rights of the claimant:
 - failure of the ALJ to address other relevant issues in the hearing decision.

2012-77715/MJB

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

MJB/pf

cc:

