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

п	1 TI		BA A	T-	ΓFR		┏.
П	u II	HE	IVI	۱ı	ırk	U	-

	Reg. No.: Issue Nos.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	2013-4341 1038, 6019 December 6, 2012 Wayne (82-18)				
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Robert J. C	havez					
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 December 6, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included						
ISSUE						
Did the Department properly ⊠ deny Claimant's application ☐ close Claimant's case for:						
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)?☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)?☐ Medical Assistance (MA)?	☐ Adult Medical As☐ State Disability A☐ Child Developme	,				
FINDINGS O	F FACT					
The Administrative Law Judge, based on the evidence on the whole record, finds as material	•	rial, and substantial				
Claimant ⊠ applied for benefits □ received benefits for:						
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP).☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP).☐ Medical Assistance (MA).	State Disability A	ssistance (AMP). Assistance (SDA). ent and Care (CDC).				

2.	On October 1, 2012, the Department denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's case due to a currrent ongoing noncompliance sanction.
3.	On October 1, 2012, the Department sent Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the denial. Closure.
4.	On October 4, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the \boxtimes denial of the application. \square closure of the case.
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
	epartment policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the dges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).
Re 42 Ag thr	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.
pro imp Re Ag	The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) ogram] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is plemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal egulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence ency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, Rule 0.3001 through Rule 400.3015.
Se Th Ag	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 of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence ency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MCL 0.105.
□ ad	The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is ministered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq.
for Se pro	The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human rvices (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA ogram pursuant to MCL 400.10, <i>et seq.</i> , and 2000 AACS, Rule 400.3151 through the 400.3180.
an	The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE d XX of the Social Security Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 90, 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, Rule 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.

Additionally, BEM 233A specifies that a claimant under a noncompliance sanction is prohibited from receiving FIP benefits for the duration of their sanction. Claimant was under sanction at the time of FIP application. Therefore, the FIP application was rightfully denied.

With regard to Claimant's CDC application, the undersigned would point out that noncompliance with the Jobs, Education and Training program (JET) is not a valid reason to close or deny a CDC application. While removal from the JET program may eliminate the need for CDC, this is not always the case. Therefore, even when under a noncompliance sanction, Claimants can still be eligible for the CDC program, depending on the need.

The Department conceded that Claimant applied for CDC on August 15, 2012. While the Department testified that CDC had been denied, the CDC application and denial was not listed on the provided EDG summary, was not contained in the notice of case action sent on October 1, 2012, and was not contained in any other evidence. Thus, there is no evidence that the Department ever registered or processed this application.

All applications for assistance must be processed. Therefore, as there is no evidence the CDC application was processed, and no evidence that a proper denial or approval was issued, the Department must process this 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 FIP application and improperly denied Claimant's CDC application.

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 act properly with regard to Claimant's FIP application and did not act properly with regard to Claimant's CDC application.

Accordingly, the Department's decision regarding FIP is AFFIRMED and the Department's decision regarding CDC is REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.

☑ THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO DO THE FOLLOWING WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER:

1. Process the CDC application of August 15, 2012.

Robert J. Chavez
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director

Department of Human Services

Date Signed: January 10, 2013

Date Mailed: January 10, 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 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

RJC/pf

