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

#### IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2013-31172 Issue Nos.: 1080, 5026 Case No.:

Hearing Date: March 25, 2013 County: Wayne (82-49)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Michael J. Bennane

## **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 February 13 2013. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on March 25, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of the Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department included

## <u>ISSUE</u>

- 1. Whether the Department properly determined that Claimant has exceeded the lifetime limit on Family Independence Program (FIP) benefits?
- 2. Whether the Department properly processed and paid Claimant's SER for rent?

### FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

- 1. Claimant applied for State Emergency Relief (SER) for rent.
- 2. The Department approved Claimant's SER for rent.
- On January 1, 2013, the Department determined that Claimant is not eligible for FIP benefits after exceeding the lifetime limit of 48 months on the receipt of statefunded FIP assistance.

- 4. On January 31, 2013, the Department notified Claimant of the intended closure on March 1, 2013
- 5. On February 13, 2013, the Department received Claimant's Request for Hearing, disputing the Department's action on the basis that the Department failed to provide the approved SER rent and the intention to close Claimant's 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).

## Family Independence Program (FIP) Closure

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 the present case, the Department failed to provide documentation of Claimant's receipt of 48 months of 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 did not present sufficient credible testimony and documentary evidence at the hearing establishing that Claimant had received at least 48 months of state-funded assistance.

This Administrative Law Judge has carefully considered and weighed the testimony and other evidence in the record and finds the Department has not met its burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that 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 failed to meet its burden adequately.

| Based    | upon   | the a | above    | Findings  | of Fact   | and  | Conclu | usions | of Law,   | and for | the   | reasons |
|----------|--------|-------|----------|-----------|-----------|------|--------|--------|-----------|---------|-------|---------|
| stated o | on the | reco  | ord, the | e Adminis | trative L | aw J | udge c | onclud | es that t | he Depa | ırtme | nt      |

| properly closed Claimant's FIP case | improperly closed Claimant's FIP case |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|

# State Emergency Relief (SER)

The State Emergency Relief (SER) program is established by 2004 PA 344. The SER program is administered pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and by, 1999 AC, Rule 400.7001 through Rule 400.7049. Department policies are found in the State Emergency Relief Manual (ERM).

At the hearing, the Department acknowledged that it had approved Claimant's SER application. Upon Claimant paying a co-payment of \$130.00, the Department testified that it paid the remainder of \$520.00, but "the property manager did not get It."

Testimony further revealed that the property manager came to the Department's office to receive a replacement check but left prior to receiving said check. When asked where the check was presently, the Department replied that it was "in limbo."

#### **Warrant Not Received**

Clients and providers sometimes request replacement of warrants never received which they do **not** believe were lost or stolen. Determine in Bridges, Benefit Issuance, whether the warrant was issued.

If the warrant **was** issued, obtain the warrant number, warrant date, amount, and Warrant Status.

If Bridges indicates it was returned to Treasury; see BAM 505, Returned Benefits.

If the warrant was issued and **not** returned it might be late in mail delivery. Instruct the payee to contact the post office to verify delivery.

If delivery is verified **but** the payee claims nonreceipt, consider the warrant lost; see Lost or Stolen Warrant in this item.

If delivery **cannot** be verified, consider the warrant not received. The payee can complete a 1778 on the **day after the fourth mail delivery day following the warrant date**; see Stop Payment and Replacement in this item. BAM 500 (November 1, 2012), pp. 1-2.

Here, the Department acted properly but has not replaced the warrant sent to Claimant's landlord by following the above policy.

## **DECISION AND ORDER**

| The Administrative Law Judge, based upo of law, decides that the Department                                  | on the above findings of fact and concl | usions |
|--|---|--------|
| ☐ did act properly. ☑ did not act properly, when it determined lifetime limit of state-funded FIP assistance |   | ·month |

Accordingly, the Department's FIP eligibility determination is

#### 2013-31172/MJB

| AFFIRMED            | ⊠ REVERSED  |
|---------------------|---|
| for the reasons sta | ated on the record.   |
| <del></del>         | MENT IS ORDERED TO DO THE FOLLOWING WITHIN 10 DAYS OF<br>AILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER: |

- 1. Initiate reinstatement of Claimant's FIP benefits Back to March 1, 2013, and supplement for any missed benefits.
- 2. Initiate Department policy delineated in BAM 500 to replace the SER warrant for rent.

Michael J. Bennane
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: May 8, 2013

Date Mailed: May 9, 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 affect the substantial rights of the claimant:
  - 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

# 2013-31172/MJB

Michigan Administrative Hearings Reconsideration/Rehearing Request P. O. Box 30639 Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

# MJB/pf

