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

IN	THE	MAT	TTFR	OF:
				. Oı .

	Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	2013-47693 1038 June 13, 2013 Wayne (15)		
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Jan Leventer				
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 June 13, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Exercises, Eligibility Specialist.				
<u>ISSUE</u>				
Did the Department properly $oxtimes$ deny Claimant's application $oxtimes$ close Claimant's case for:				
Family Independence Program (FIP)? Food Assistance Program (FAP)? Medical Assistance (MA)?		sistance (AMP)? ssistance (SDA)? ent and Care (CDC)?		
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 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 May 6, 2013, the Department denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's case due to a determination that she failed to comply with the work-readiness requirements for receiving FIP benefits.		
3.	On May 6, 2013, the Department sent Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the denial. Closure.		
4.	On May 13, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the ⊠ denial of the application. □ closure of the case.		
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW		
	partment policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the dges Eligibility 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, Rule 400.3101 through Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996.			
Ad	ditionally, the following findings of fact and conclusions of law are entered in this se.		
	April 16, 2013, the Department issued a PATH artnership. Accountability. Training. Hope) Appointment Notice requiring Claimant to pear for orientation on Monday, April 29, 2013.		
att 20 En	April 19, 2013, the Claimant called the Department and indicated she would be ending her father's funeral out of state and could not appear on Monday, April 29, 13. Claimant also indicated she was pregnant, she was recently seen in the nergency Department with premature cramping, and was told she had a high-risk egnancy. The Department excused Claimant from the April 29, 2013 orientation.		
wit	so on April 19, 2013, the Department sent Claimant a Medical Needs - PATH form h which to make a formal request for a medical deferral from the FIP work-readiness quirements. Dept. Exh. 1, pp. 6-7.		
Ma	April 25, 2013, , signed the Medical Needs form. It states that Claimant is not to work from ay 6, 2013-July 29, 2013. The Medical Needs Form states, "off work @34 wk preg. 5-13." <i>Id.</i> , p. 6.		

On April 29, 2013, Claimant submitted the Medical Needs form to the Department. *Id.*, p. 6.

On May 6, 2013, the Department denied Claimant's application. *Id.*, p. 2.

In this case the Claimant seeks FIP benefits for the period of April 21, 2013-May 31, 2013, a period of more than five weeks. However, it is found and determined that during that period she did not meet the work-readiness requirements, nor did she have a medical needs deferral.

Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 230A, "Employment and/or Self-Sufficiency-Related Activities, FIP," requires FIP customers to work or to be engaged in work-readiness activities. Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 230A (2013). In this case, Claimant sought a deferral, but her obstetrician provided only a limited deferral which began at a date after the time for which she is requesting benefits.

The plain language used on the form demonstrates that he calculated Claimant's thirty-fourth week and took her off work in reference to that date. Therefore, Claimant was not excused from work-readiness participation before that date. Because Claimant's physician provided only a limited deferral, it is found and concluded that Claimant was not deferred during the time period in question.

Claimant testified that she requested both a second PATH orientation appointment and a request form for a medical deferral. However, the Department sent out only the medical deferral form because she was instructed not to send high-risk pregnancy clients to PATH. If Claimant still wanted to go to PATH, but did not receive the orientation form, she could have called the Department and requested it a second time. If her request was then denied, she would have had grounds for an appeal.

Based upon the above Findings of Fact a stated on the record, the Administrative La	and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons w Judge concludes that the Department
 □ properly denied Claimant's application □ properly closed Claimant's case □	improperly denied Claimant's application improperly closed Claimant's case
for: 🗌 AMP 🖾 FIP 🗌 FAP 🗌 MA 🗌 SE	DA CDC.

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

$oxed{\boxtimes}$ did act properly.	did not act properly.
	ment's AMP FIP FAP MA SDA CDC decision WERSED for the reasons stated on the record.

Jan Leventer

Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: June 18, 2013
Date Mailed: June 18, 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 Michigan Administrative Hearings
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request
P. O. Box 30639
Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

JL/tm

