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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg.No. Issue No. Case No. Hearing Date: 2013 16184 1038,

January 14, 2013 Wayne County DHS (76)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Lynn M. Ferris

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. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on January 14, 2013. The Claimant appeared and testified. A witness, for the second of the hearing. Sharon A nderson, FIS, and FIM, appeared on behalf of the Department.

<u>ISSUE</u>

Whether the Department correctly sanc tioned and closed the Claimant's cash assistance (FIP) for non-compliance with work-related activities without good cause.

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. The Claimant was an ongoing participant of the Work First program and was an ongoing recipient of FIP benefits.
- 2. The Department sent the Claim ant a Notice of Non-Complianc e on 11/13/12 indicating that the Claimant did not m 11/12/12.
- 3. The Notice of Non-Compliance scheduled a triage for 11/12/12.
- 4. The Claimant did not attend the triage as she did not receive the Notice of Non-Compliance.

- The Department closed the Claimant's FIP case effective 12/1/12 and imposed a 3 month s anction for non-compliance with Wo rk First participation without good cause. Exhibit 1
- 6. No Depart ment representative or Work First representative that attended the triage attended the hearing. No evidence that the triage was held and the bas is for determining no good cause was provided by the Department at the hearing.
- 7. The Claimant requested a hearing on 12 /11/12 protesting the closure of her FIP cash assistance case.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Family Independence Program ("FIP") was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 8 USC 60 1, *et seq.* The Department of Human Services ("D HS" or "Department"), formerly known as the Family Independence Agency, administers the FIP program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq* and Michigan Administrative Code Rules 400.3101-3131. Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual ("BAM"), the Bridges Eligibility Manual ("BEM"), and the Bridges Reference Manual ("BRM").

DHS requires clients to participat e in employ ment and self-sufficiency related activities and to ac cept employment when offered. BEM 233A All Work E ligible Individuals ("WEI") as a condition of e ligibility must engage in employment and/or self-sufficiency related activities. BEM 233A The WEI is consid ered non-c ompliant f or failing or refusing to appear and participate with the Jobs, Education, and Training Program ("JET") or other employment service provider. BEM 233A Good cause is a valid reas on for non-compliance with employment and/or self -sufficiency related activit ies that are based on f actors that are beyond the control of the non-compliant person. BEM 233A Failure to comply without good c ause results in FIP closure. BEM 233A T he first and second oc currences of non-compliance r esults in a 3 month FIP closur e. BEM 233A The third occurrence results in a 12 month sanction.

JET participants will not be terminated from a JET program without first scheduling a triage meeting with the client to jointly discuss non-compliance and good c ause. BEM 233A In processing a FIP closure, the Department is required to send the client a notice of non-compliance, DH S-2444, which must include the date(s) of the non-compliance; the reason the client was determined to be non-compliant; and the penalty duration. BEM 233A In addit ion, a triage must be held within the negative action period. BEM 233A A good cause e determination is made during the triage and prior to the negative action effective date. BEM 233A. However, a failure to participate can be overcome if the client has good cause. Good cause is a valid reason for failing to participate with employment and/or self-sufficiency-related activities that are based on factors that are beyond the control of the Claimant. BEM 233A. The penalty for

noncompliance is FIP closure. However, a failure to participate can be overcome if the client h as good ca use. Good c ause is a valid reason for failing to participate with employment and/or s elf-sufficiency-related activities that are based on factors that are beyond the control of the Claimant. BEM 233A. The penalty for non-compliance is FIP closure. BEM 233a provides direction to the Department as follows when determining good cause:

Determine good caus e based on the best information available during the triage and prior to the negative action date. Good cause may be verified by information already on file with DHS or the work participation program.

In this case, the Claimant attended the Work First program and admitted that she wa s aware that her participation hours had fallen short and that one of her work participation logs was late, although she was at the doc tor's with her baby on that occasion and provided a doctor's note to the program. The Claimant provided the log as directed the following Thursday and the log was accepted. The Claimant also credibly tes tified that she was meeting participation requirements. The Claimant also credibly testified that she did not receive the notice of non-comp liance and was having some problem with her mail. I find that t he Claimant's testimony rebutted the normal presumption that a letter properly addres sed is presumed to be delivered, however, Claimant's testimony regarding mail receipt problems rebutted the presumption.

On the basis of this testimony it is found that there was no basis presented to suppor t the sanction that was imposed, as the Claim ant did provide her participation log on Thursday as directed by the Work First program. Because no one from either the Work First program or the Department with ac tual knowledge indic ated the basis for Claimant's non-compliance, other than general non-participati on, or whether an actual triage was held, it is determined that the Department did not meet its burden of proof to show that its decis ion to find the Claimant in non-c ompliance with work participation requirement without good cause was correct. The Claimant's testimony was very clear and credible.

No one from the Work First program or department who attended the triage attended the hearing and thus Claimant's credible testimony was unrebutted.

After reviewing the documents submitted at the hearing and the testimony of the parties provided under oath, it is determined that the Depar tment did not meet its burden of proof to demonstrate that it correctly determined that the Claimant failed in her Wor k First participation requirements or failed to demonstrate good cause.

The evidence presented only demonstrated that the Department scheduled a triage and that the Department determined that the Claimant had failed t o meet participation requirements and imposed a sanction. The Department did not demonstrate that it followed Department policy regarding finding of good cause at the triage and thus, the

Department incorrectly found no good cause and instituted closure of the Claimant's FIP case.

Based of the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and the testimony of witnesses and the documentary evidence received, the Department has not demonstrated that it correctly followed and applied Department policy in closing and sanctioning the Claimant's FIP case for r non-compliance without good cause and imposing a 3 month sanction. BEM 233A.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above findings of fact and conclusions of law finds t hat the department incorrectly closed the Claimant's cash assistance FI P case, and improperly imposed a 3 month sancti on closing the Claimant's case for noncompliance with work-related activities for non-participation with the Work First program. Accordingly, the department's determination is REVERSED.

Accordingly it is ordered:

- 1. The Department shall initiate reinstatement of the Claimant's FIP case retroactive to the date of closure (12/1/12).
- 2. The Department shall supplement t he Claimant for any FIP benefits she was otherwise entitled to receive in accordance with Department policy.
- 3. The Department shall remove from its records and the Claimant's case file the 3 month sanction it im posed on the Cla imant for non-compliance with work participation requirements.

Lynn M. Ferris`

Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: January 23, 2013

Date Mailed: January 23, 2013

NOTICE: Michigan Administrative Hearing Syst em (MAHS) may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a par ty within 30 days of the mailing date of this Dec ision and Order . MAHS will not order a rehearing or

reconsideration on the Department's mo tion where the final decis ion 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 ti mely 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 <u>MAY</u> be granted if there is newly discovered evidence that could affect the outcome of the original hearing decision.
- A reconsideration <u>MAY</u> 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

Re consideration/Rehearing Request P. O. Box 30639 Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

LMF/cl

