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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 201222085

Issue No.: 1021

Case No.:

Hearing Date: March 28, 2012

County: Genesee County DHS (06)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: C. Adam Purnell

RECOMMENDED HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 following Claim ant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on March 28, 2012 from Lansing, Michigan. Claimant personally appeared and provided testimony. The Department of Human Services (Department) was represented by Department personnel.

ISSUE

Did the Department properly det ermined Claimant's eligibilit y for Family Independence Program (FIP) benefits?

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

- 1. Claimant was a recipient of FIP benefits at all times relevant to this hearing.
- On November 30, 2011, the Department mail ed Claimant a Notice of Cas e Action (DHS-1605) which closed Cla imant's FIP benefits becaus e s he reached the 60 month limit for federally-funded FIP benefits.
- 3. On December 5, 2011, Claimant requested a hearing.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Department policies are contained in the Br idges 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 W ork Opportunity Reconc iliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 42 USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly k nown as the Family Independence Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3101 t hrough R 400.3131. FI P replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996.

The FIP benefit program is not an entitlem ent. BEM 234. Ti me 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-sufficien cy. BEM 234. Effect ive October 1, 2011, BEM 234 restricts the total cumulative mont has 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.

Testimony and other evidence must be we ighed 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 NW 2d 403 (2007). 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). Moreover, it is for the fact-finder to gauge the demeanor and veracity of the witnesses who appear before him, as best he is able. See, e.g., *Caldwell v Fox*, 394 Mich 401, 407; 231 NW 2d 46 (1975); *Zeeland Far m Services, Inc v J BL Enterprises, Inc*, 219 Mich App 190, 195; 555 NW2d 733 (1996).

This Administrative Law Judge has carefully considered and weighed the testimony and other evidence in the record and finds the computer-generated printouts provided by the Department establishing the to tal months in which Claimant received federally-funded FIP benefits to be persuasive. This Administ rative Law Judge further finds Claimant's disagreement with the Department's calculation to be unper suasive in the absence of any supporting documentation.

Accordingly, the Administrative Law Judge finds that, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence presented during the hearing, the Department acted in accordance with policy in closing Claimant's FIP benefits for the reason that Claimant has reached the 60-month limit of federally-funded FIP assistance and was therefore no longer eligible to receive such assistance.

However, because t he De partment's determinat ion of Claim ant's eliq ibility for FI P benefits was based on the Depart ment's application of a policy and statute the validity of which remains the subject of a pending court challenge, ¹ Claimant's hearing request is not within the scope of aut hority delegated to this Admi nistrative Law Judge by the Department's Director. Spec ifically, the Director's July 31, 2011 Delegation of Hearing Authority provides in relevant part:

Administrative hearing officers have no authority to make decisions on constitutional grounds, overrule statutes, overrule promul gated regulations, or overrule or make exceptions to Department polic y... A presiding administrative hearing offic er shall make a recommended decision to the Policy Hearing Authority in those cases... in which the presiding adm inistrative hearing officer believe s Department policy to be out of conformity with case law, st atute, or promulgated regulations. The Polic y Hearing Authority will issue a final decision in such cases, and the final decision shall be precedent binding on the administr ative hearing officers. (Emphasis added.)

Consequently, the Administrative Law Judge makes the fo llowing recommended decision.

Smith, et al v Department of Human Services. ____ N.W.2d____, 2012 WL 2401397, Mich. App., June 26, 2012 (NO. 309447, 309894); smith, et al v. Department of Human Services, 820 N.W.2d 773; ____ Mich ____, Sept. 21, 2012.

RECOMMENDED DECISION

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusion sof law, decides that the Department acted in accordance with policy in closing Claimant's FIP benefits for the reason that Claimant has reached the 60-month limit of federally funded FIP assistance. Therefore, this Administrative Law Judge recommends that the Department's closure of Claimant's FIP benefits case be **AFFIRMED**.

EXCEPTIONS

The parties may file Exceptions to this Recommended Decision within 15 (fifteen) days after it is issued and entered. An opposing party may file a response within 5 (five) days after Exceptions are filed. Any such Ex ceptions shall be filed with Maura Corrigan, Director, Department of Human Services, 235 S. Grand Ave, P.O. Box 30037, Lansing, Michigan, 48909.

<u>/s/</u>

C. Adam Purnell Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: April 29, 2013

Date Mailed: May 1, 2013

CAP/aca

