

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 201275642  
Issue No.: 1003  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: March 20, 2013  
County: Macomb 12

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** C. Adam Purnell

**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 March 20, 2013 from Lansing, Michigan. Claimant personally appeared and provided testimony. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED] (Family Independence Specialist) and [REDACTED] (Lead Support Specialist-Office of Child Support).

**ISSUE**

Did the Department properly close Claimant's Family Independence Program (FIP) case due to noncooperation with child support?

**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 Office of Child Support (OCS) determined that Claimant was in non-cooperation with child support because she failed to establish paternity or secure child support by withholding information about the absent parent.
2. On August 2, 2012, the Department mailed Claimant a Notice of Case Action (DHS-1605) which closed Claimant's FIP case effective September 1, 2012 because she "failed to cooperate in establishing paternity or securing child support."

3. On August 15, 2012, Claimant submitted a request for hearing to challenge the Department's decision to close her FIP 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 Mich Admin Code, R 400.3101 through R 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996.

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 Mich Admin Code, R 400.5001 through R 400.5015.

Department policy indicates that clients can pursue any potential benefits for which they may be eligible. BEM 270. One of these benefits is child support. BEM 255. The Department takes the position that families are strengthened when children's needs are met. BEM 255. The Department also believes that parents have a responsibility to meet their children's needs by providing support and/or cooperating with the department, including the Office of Child Support (OCS), the Friend of the Court (FOC) and the prosecuting attorney to establish paternity and/or obtain support from an absent parent. BEM 255.

When OCS, FOC or a prosecuting attorney determines a client is in cooperation or noncooperation the determination is entered in the Department's computer system known as "Bridges" via a systems interface. BEM 255. When the client is in noncooperation, Bridges will generate a notice closing the affected program(s) or reduce the client benefit amount in response to the determination. BEM 255. A copy of the details regarding the cooperation or noncooperation can be requested by contacting the primary worker noted in the Child Support (CS) icon in Bridges. BEM 255.

Department policy states that the custodial parent or alternative caretaker of children must comply with all requests for action or information needed to establish paternity and/or obtain child support on behalf of children for whom they receive assistance, unless a claim of good cause for not cooperating has been granted or is pending. BEM 255. Absent parents are required to support their children. BEM 255. Support includes all of the following: (1) child support, (2) medical support and (3) payment for medical care from any third party. BEM 255. A parent who does not live with the child due solely

to the parent's active duty in a uniformed service of the U.S. is considered to be living in the child's home. BEM 255.

Failure to cooperate without good cause results in disqualification. BEM 255. Disqualification includes member removal, as well as denial or closure of program benefits, depending on the type of assistance. BEM 255. However, a pregnant woman who fails to cooperate may still be eligible for MA. BEM 255.

Cooperation is required in all phases of the process to establish paternity and obtain support which includes **all** of the following: (1) contacting the support specialist when requested; (2) **providing all known information about the absent parent**; (3) appearing at the office of the prosecuting attorney when requested; (4) taking any actions needed to establish paternity and obtain child support (including but not limited to testifying at hearings or obtaining blood tests). BEM 255.

Failure to cooperate without good cause results in disqualification of the individual who failed to cooperate. BEM 255. The individual and their needs are removed from the CDC EDG for a minimum of one month. BEM 255.

The department's computer system (Bridges) will not restore or reopen benefits for a disqualified member until the client cooperates (as recorded on the child support non-cooperation record) or support/paternity action is no longer needed. BEM 255. Bridges will end the non-cooperation record if any of the following exist:

- OCS records the comply date.
- Support/paternity action is no longer a factor in the client's eligibility (for example child leaves the group).
- For FIP only, the client cooperates with the requirement to return assigned support payments, or an over issuance is established and the support is certified.
- For FIP and FAP only, a one month disqualification is served when conditions (mentioned above) to end the disqualification are not met prior to the negative action effective date. BEM 255.

Here, the Department contends that Claimant has failed to cooperate with OCS by failing to "provide all known information about the absent parent." See BEM 255. Claimant testified that she spoke with a Department employee on the phone and provided an address and certain identifying characteristics regarding the absent parent (Willie Bryant). When questioned during the hearing, Claimant had difficulty keeping her story straight with regard to the dates of the alleged conversations and what transpired during these purported conversations. Claimant also testified that she last saw the absent father in a night club in Detroit in 2011, but then she recalled pleading guilty to

an offense involving the absent parent at a later date. Overall, Claimant's testimony was confusing and disjointed.

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). 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 NW2d 46 (1975); *Zeeland Farm Services, Inc v JBL Enterprises, Inc*, 219 Mich App 190, 195; 555 NW2d 733 (1996).

This Administrative Law Judge does not find Claimant's testimony to be credible. Claimant failed to clearly answer basic questions from the Administrative Law Judge during the hearing. When pressed, Claimant changed her answers on more than one occasion. The evidence shows that Claimant was in non-cooperation with OCS and has failed to show good cause for her noncooperation.

#### **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the Department properly sanctioned Claimant from FIP benefits due to noncooperation with child support without good cause.

Accordingly, the Department's determination is **AFFIRMED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

#### **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 when it closed Claimant's FIP case due to noncooperation with child support.

Accordingly, the Department's FIP decision is **AFFIRMED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

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

Date Signed: March 25, 2013

Date Mailed: March 26, 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 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

CAP/cr

cc:

