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

| IN | THE | ΜΔΤ | TFR | OF: |
|----|-----|-----|---------|-------------|
| | | | 1 – 1 \ | U I. |

| | Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County: | 2013-41252 1018; 3008; 6015 July 3, 2013 Kent | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Carmen G. Fahie | | | | | |
| 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 selephone hearing was held on Wednesday, July 3, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan Participants on behalf of Claimant included, the Claimant. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included, James Bowman, APS and Melissa Heath, FIS. | | | | | |
| <u>ISSUE</u> | | | | | |
| Due to a failure to comply with the verification requirements, did the Departmen properly \boxtimes deny Claimant's application \square close Claimant's case \square reduce Claimant's penefits for: | | | | | |
| ☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)?☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)?☐ Medical Assistance (MA)? | | assistance (SDA)? ent and Care (CDC)? ey Relief (SER)? | | | |
| FINDINGS OF FACT | | | | | |
| The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the competent, material, and substantia evidence on the whole record, including testimony of witnesses, finds as material fact: | | | | | |
| Claimant ⊠ applied for □ was receiving: □ SER. | ⊠FIP ⊠FAP □M/ | A □SDA ⊠CDC □ | | | |
| On March 12, 2013, the Department: ☑ denied Claimant's application ☐ closed Claimant's case ☐ reduced Claimant's benefits | | | | | |

for excess income for FIP based on application.

| 3. | Claimant \boxtimes was \square was not provided with a Verification Checklist (DHS-3503). | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| 4. | Claimant was required to submit requested verification by March 22, 2013. | | |
| 5. | On March 29, 2013, the Department denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's case reduced Claimant's benefits for failure to submit verification in a timely manner. | | |
| 6. | On March 29, 2013, the Department sent notice of the ☐ denial of Claimant's application. ☐ closure of Claimant's case. ☐ reduction of Claimant's benefits. | | |
| 7. | On April 9, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the ightharpoonup denial. ightharpoonup claim of the claim of the claim. | | |
| | CONCLUSIONS OF LAW | | |
| | epartment policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges gibility Manual (BEM) and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT). | | |
| ☐ The Family Independence Program (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 (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, R 400.3101 through Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996. | | | |
| ∑ The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) program] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, <i>et seq.</i> , and 1999 AC, R 400.3001 through Rule 400.3015. | | | |
| Se Th | The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social curity Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). e Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the A program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MCL 400.105. | | |
| for as | The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program which provides financial assistance disabled persons is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department (formerly known the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 0.10, et seq., and 2000 AACS, R 400.3151 through Rule 400.3180. | | |

201341252/CF

| ☑ The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE and XX of the Social Security Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 1990, and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. The program is implemented by Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 98 and 99. The Department provides services to adults and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and 1999 AC, R 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015. | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| ☐ The State Emergency Relief (SER) program is established by 2004 PA 344. The SER program is administered pursuant to MCL 400.10, <i>et seq.</i> , and by, 1999 AC, R 400.7001 through Rule 400.7049. Department policies are found in the State Emergency Relief Manual (ERM). | | | | |
| Additionally, the Claimant failed to turn in her/his required verification of bank statements and CDC provider re-enrollment to verify eligibility by the due date, which resulted in her/his case being denied/closed. | | | | |
| The Claimant's FIP application was denied due to the excess income stated on her application where she stated that she worked 35 hours per week at \$7.50 per hour. Department Exhibit 12. The Claimant had excess income for FIP because her earned income of \$1,158, minus the \$200 earned income standard, and the \$191 earned income deduction-percentage, resulted in a net earned income of \$767. Her net earned income of \$767 was greater that the FIP payment standard of \$403. As a result, the Claimant failed the income test because of excess income. Department Exhibit 18-19. | | | | |
| During the hearing, the Claimant stated that she rarely gets 35 hours per week, but more like 17 hours per week. The Claimant is entitled to re-apply for benefits by putting that she works 17 hours per week, then the Department would verify her last 30 days of income to determine FIP eligibility. | | | | |
| Therefore, the Department correctly determined that the Claimant was not eligible for FIP because of excess income and CDC/FAP because of failure to provide verification. BAM 105, 110, 210, 220, 600, and 130. BEM 400, 500, 505, 515, 518, and 554. | | | | |
| 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 \square properly \square improperly | | | | |
| ☐ closed Claimant's case.☐ denied Claimant's application.☐ reduced Claimant's benefits. | | | | |
| 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 \square did act properly. \square did not act properly. | | | | |

| Accordingly, the Department's decision is AFFIRMI reasons stated on the record. | ED REVERSED for the |
|---|------------------------------|
| ☐ THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO DO THE FOLLO THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDE | |
| /s/ | |
| _ | Carmen G. Fahie |
| | Administrative Law Judge |
| | For Maura Corrigan, Director |
| De | enartment of Human Services |

Date Signed: 07/10/2013

Date Mailed: <u>07/11/2013</u>

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 receipt 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

201341252/CF

CF/pw

cc:

