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

	THE				_
IN	IHE	MA	TTFF	<b>ર</b> ()	ь.

	Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	2013-21347 1025 February 19, 2013 Wayne (76)			
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Jan Leventer					
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 February 19, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included process (Department) included process.					
<u>ISSUE</u>					
Did the Department properly $\boxtimes$ deny Claimant's application $\square$ close Claimant's case for:					
Family Independence Program (FIP)?  Food Assistance Program (FAP)?  Medical Assistance (MA)?	_	sistance (AMP)? ssistance (SDA)? nt and Care (CDC)?			
FINDINGS OF FACT					
The Administrative Law Judge, based on the evidence on the whole record, finds as material fa		rial, and substantia			
<ol> <li>Claimant</li></ol>					

Adult Medical Assistance (AMP).

State Disability Assistance (SDA).

Child Development and Care (CDC).

☐ Family Independence Program (FIP).

Food Assistance Program (FAP).

Medical Assistance (MA).

Su	On December 28, 2013, the Department    including denied Claimant's application   including closed Claimant's case   included to a determination that she was not in compliance with the Office of Child apport and that she failed to participate in the Jobs, Education and Training (JET) approach.				
3.	On December 28, 2013, the Department sent  Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)  notice of the denial. Closure.				
4.	On January 7, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the ⊠ denial of the application. ☐ closure of the case.				
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW					
	epartment policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the idges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).				
Re 42 Ag thr	The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal esponsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193 (USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence gency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, Rule 400.3101 (rough Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program fective October 1, 1996.				

Additionally, at the hearing the Department failed to present evidence that Claimant did not cooperate with the Department's Office of Child Support, and, it failed to present evidence that Claimant did not attend the JET program. On the other hand, at the hearing the Claimant testified that she did contact the Office of Child Support on February 1, 2013, and that she did contact the JET program to reschedule her appointment because her pipes were frozen.

Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 105, "Rights and Responsibilities," requires the Department to determine eligibility, provide benefits and protect client rights. It also requires the client to cooperate fully with the Department's requests for information and documentation. BAM 105 is the Department policy that is applicable in this case. Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 105 (2012).

In this case the Department failed to determine Claimant's eligibility. There is nothing in the record to establish that Claimant failed to cooperate with either the Department's Office of Child Support or the JET program. Because the Department failed to establish that it determined eligibility in this case, the Department's denial must be reversed.

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 denied Claimant's application properly closed Claimant's case	<ul><li></li></ul>				
for:					
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.					
Accordingly, the Department's AMP FIP FAP MA SDA CDC decision is AFFIRMED REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.					
☑ THE DEPARTMENT SHALL INITIATE WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER, THE FOLLOWING:					
<ol> <li>Reinstate Claimant's FIP application.</li> <li>Change Claimant's status with regard to the Office of Child Support, from noncooperative to cooperative status.</li> <li>Delete any reference in Claimant's file that states she is not compliant with the Office of Child Support.</li> </ol>					
<ol> <li>Reschedule Claimant for an appointing program.</li> <li>All steps shall be taken in accordance were appointed to the control of the control</li></ol>	ment to attend the JET work participation with Department policy and procedure.				
	Jan Goenly				
Date Signed: <u>February 20, 2013</u>	Jan Leventer Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services				

Date Mailed: February 21, 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 <u>MAY</u> 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

JL/tm

