

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2013-35554
Issue No.: 1038
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: April 24, 2013
County: Kent County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Corey A. Arendt

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 April 24, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED].

ISSUE

Did the Department properly terminate and sanction the Claimant's Family Independence Program (FIP) benefits for noncompliance with PATH?

FINDINGS OF FACT

I find as material fact, based upon the competent, material and substantial evidence on the whole record:

1. On or around November 10, 2008, the Claimant was found to be noncompliant with the WF/JET program.
2. On August 13, 2012, the Claimant re-enrolled/re-engaged in the WF/JET program and attended a scheduled orientation.
3. On February 14, 2013, the Claimant's Case Manager at [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) [REDACTED] mailed a retention meeting letter to the Claimant. The letter indicated the Claimant had a retention meeting scheduled for February 22, 2013.
4. On February 15, 2013, the Claimant talked to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] told the Claimant about the retention meeting on February 22, 2013 and indicated the appointment, time and date and indicated the Claimant should receive a letter in the mail regarding the appointment.

5. On February 22, 2013, the Claimant failed to appear for the retention meeting.
6. On February 22, 2013, [REDACTED] requested a triage due to the Claimant's failure to attend the retention meeting.
7. On February 25, 2013, the Department sent the Claimant a notice of case action and notice of noncompliance. The notice of case action indicated the Claimant's FIP benefits were being closed and sanctioned for noncompliance with the PATH program. The notice of noncompliance indicated the Claimant had a triage scheduled for March 6, 2013.
8. On March 5, 2013, the Claimant requested a hearing to dispute the closure of her FIP case.
9. On March 6, 2013 the Claimant participated in a triage. During the triage, the Claimant indicated she had forgotten about the appointment and therefore missed it. Based upon the information the Department acquired at the triage, the Department determined the Claimant did not have good cause for failing to attend the retention meeting.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The FIP was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 8 USC 601, *et seq.* The Department administers the FIP program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MAC R 400.3101-3131. The FIP program replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996. Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

DHS requires clients to participate in employment and self-sufficiency-related activities and to accept employment when offered. Our focus is to assist clients in removing barriers so they can participate in activities which lead to self-sufficiency. However, there are consequences for a client who refuses to participate, without good cause.

The goal of the FIP penalty policy is to obtain client compliance with appropriate work and/or self-sufficiency-related assignments and to ensure that barriers to such compliance have been identified and removed. The goal is to bring the client into compliance.

A Work Eligible Individual (WEI), see BEM 228, who fails, without good cause, to participate in employment or self-sufficiency-related activities, must be penalized.

- As a condition of eligibility, all WEIs and non-WEIs must work or engage in employment and/or self-sufficiency-related activities.

Good cause is a valid reason for noncompliance with employment and/or self-sufficiency-related activities that are based on factors that are beyond the control of the noncompliant person. A claim of good cause must be verified and documented for member adds and recipients. Document the good cause determination in Bridges and the FSSP under the "Participation and Compliance" tab.

The penalty for noncompliance without good cause is FIP closure. Effective April 1, 2007, the following minimum penalties apply:

- For the first occurrence on the FIP case, close the FIP for 3 calendar months unless the client is excused from the noncompliance as noted in "First Case Noncompliance Without Loss of Benefits" below.
- For the second occurrence on the FIP case, close the FIP for 3 calendar months.
- For the third and subsequent occurrence on the FIP case, close the FIP for 12 calendar months.
- The penalty counter also begins April 1, 2007 regardless of the previous number of noncompliance penalties.

Determine good cause 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 MWA.

If the client does NOT provide a good cause reason within the negative action period, determine good cause based on the best information available. If no good cause exists, allow the case to close. If good cause is determined to exist, delete the negative action. BEM 233A, pp. 10-11.

Testimony and other evidence must be weighed and considered according to its reasonableness.¹ Moreover, the weight and credibility of this evidence is generally for the fact-finder to determine.² In evaluating the credibility and weight to be given to 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.³

I have carefully considered and weighed the testimony and other evidence in the record and find the Department's witnesses to be more credible than the Claimant as the Department witnesses had a clearer grasp of the dates, times and events in question and because the Claimant lacked documentary evidence to corroborate her claim regarding her purse being stolen etc.

¹ *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).

² *Dep't of Community Health*, 274 Mich App at 372; *People v Terry*, 224 Mich App 447, 452; 569 NW2d 641 (1997).

³ *People v Wade*, 303 Mich 303 (1942), *cert den*, 318 US 783 (1943).

Therefore, based upon the evidence, I find that the Claimant did not have good cause for failing to attend the retention meeting as scheduled and as a result, the Department acted appropriately in closing and sanctioning the Claimant's FIP case.

DECISION AND ORDER

I find, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decide that:

1. The Department properly closed and sanctioned the Claimant's FIP benefits for noncompliance with PATH requirements.

Accordingly, the Department's actions are **AFFIRMED**.



Corey A. Arendt
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: April 25, 2013

Date Mailed: April 25, 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 **MAY** 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

2013-35554/CAA

Recons ideration/Rehearing Request
P. O. Box 30639
Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

CAA/las

cc:

