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

	TIL	A A	TTC	$\mathbf{n}$	<b>~</b> E.
IN	ΙН	MΑ	TTE	ĸ	JF:

Reg. No.: 2013-30012

Issue No.: 1021

Case No.: Hearing Date:

County:

March 27, 2013 Wayne (17)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Susan C. Burke

## **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 27, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included FIM.

#### ISSUE

Did the Department properly ☐ deny Claimant's application ☒ close Claimant's case				
calculate Claimant's benefits for:	ant's application 🖂 close Claimant's case			
<ul><li>☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)?</li><li>☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)?</li><li>☐ Medical Assistance (MA)?</li></ul>	☐ Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)? ☐ State Disability Assistance (SDA)? ☐ Child Development and Care (CDC)			
FINDINGS OF FACT				
The Administrative Law Judge, based on evidence on the whole record, finds as materi				
<ol> <li>Claimant ☐ applied for benefits ☒ receive</li> </ol>	ed benefits for:			
<ul><li>☐ Family Independence Program (FIP).</li><li>☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP).</li><li>☐ Medical Assistance (MA).</li></ul>	☐ Adult Medical Assistance (AMP). ☐ State Disability Assistance (SDA). ☐ Child Development and Care (CDC).			

	On March 1, 2013, the Department
	The Department sent  Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)  notice of the denial. Closure. calculation.
4.	Claimant did receive 60 months or more of FIP benefits.
5.	On February 15, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the $\Box$ denial of the application. $\boxtimes$ closure of the case. $\Box$ calculation.
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
	partment policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the dges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).
Res 42 Age thro	The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal sponsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence ency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, Rule 400.3101 ough Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program ective October 1, 1996.

In the present case, the Department closed Claimant's FIP case due to receiving 60 months or more of FIP benefits.

At the hearing, Claimant had the opportunity to review the federal FIP Time Limit printout. Claimant at first disagreed that she received FIP benefits for the years 1996 through 2003, but upon more detailed information being provided by the Department, Claimant agreed that she received some benefits for some of those years. Based upon the proof provided by the Department, I am satisfied that the Department met its burden of proof in showing that Claimant received FIP benefits for 60 months or more of FIP benefits.

Therefore, per BEM 234, the Department was correct in denying Claimant's FIP application.

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 ☐ properly calculated Claimant's benefits ☐ improperly closed Claimant's case ☐ improperly calculated Claimant's benefits
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 not act properly. ☐ did not act properly.
Accordingly, the Department's $\square$ AMP $\boxtimes$ FIP $\square$ FAP $\square$ MA $\square$ SDA $\square$ CDC decision is $\boxtimes$ AFFIRMED $\square$ REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.
Susan C. Burke  Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: March 27, 2013

Date Mailed: March 28, 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 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.

# 2013-30012/SCB

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

## SCB/tm

