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

#### IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2013-23410

Issue No.: <u>1080</u>

Case No.: Hearing Date:

County:

Genesee County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Kevin Scully

#### **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 hearing was held on the Claimant included. Participants on behalf of the Department included.

## <u>ISSUE</u>

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. The Claimant was an ongoing Family Independence Program (FIP) recipient until
- 2. On the Claimant is not eligible for FIP benefits after exceeding the lifetime limit on the receipt of state-funded FIP assistance.
- 3. On Comparison of the Claimant of the closure.

4. On Hearing, the Department received the Claimant's Request for Hearing, disputing the Department's action on the basis that the Department improperly determined the number of months that the Claimant has received state funded Family Independence Program (FIP) 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 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.

In this case, the Department presented records showing that the Claimant has received 48 months of state-funded Family Independence Program (FIP) benefits.

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 presented sufficient credible testimony and documentary evidence at the hearing establishing that, as of the claimant had received at least 48 months of state-funded assistance.

The Claimant argued that the Department should not have counted a portion of the FIP benefits she received towards the state funded FIP count. The Claimant argued that she should have been exempted due to her disability lasting longer than 90 days.

A FIP group that has a parent deferred from PATH due to a verified disability or long-term incapacity lasting longer than 90 days. Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 234 (June 1, 2013), pp 2-3.

The Claimant testified that she applied for disability benefits but her application was denied. The Claimant testified that she is appealing the denial of disability benefits.

This Administrative Law Judge finds that the Claimant has failed to establish a verified disability or long term incapacity lasting longer than 90 days. The Claimant failed to present sufficient evidence supporting a finding that certain months of FIP benefits should have been exempted from her state funded FIP count.

This Administrative Law Judge has carefully considered and weighed the testimony and other evidence in the record and finds the Department has 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 properly determined that the Claimant has exceeded the lifetime limit for state-funded Family Independence Program (FIP) benefits.

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

improperly closed Claimant's FIP case

properly closed Claimant's FIP case

#### **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above of law, decides that the Department	findings of fact and conclusions
<ul><li>☑ did act properly.</li><li>☐ did not act properly, when it determined that the Cla lifetime limit of state-funded FIP assistance.</li></ul>	imant has reached the 48-month
Accordingly, the Department's FIP eligibility determination	on is
□ REVERSED	
for the reasons stated on the record.	
	Kevin Scully Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services
Date Signed:	Department of Human Services
Date Mailed:	

**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:

## 2013-23410/KS

• 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

# KS/kl

