

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2013-48033  
Issue No.: 1021  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: June 20, 2013  
County: Kalamazoo 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 upon the Claimant's request for a hearing received by the Department of Human Services (Department) on May 13, 2013. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on June 20, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of the Claimant included [REDACTED] Participants on behalf of the Department included [REDACTED]

**ISSUE**

Whether the Department properly determined that the Claimant has exceeded the lifetime limit on Family Independence Program (FIP) benefits?

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

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

1. As of March 2013, the Claimant received FIP benefits.
2. At some point in time prior to March 21, 2013, the Claimant requested a medical deferral from the PATH program.
3. On March 21, 2013, the Medical Review Team (MRT) determined the Claimant was not disabled and therefore capable of participating in PATH.
4. On or around March 22, 2013, the Department adjusted the Claimant's deferral status triggering a notice the Claimant had exceeded the Federal time limit counters.
5. On March 22, 2013, the Department sent the Claimant a notice of case action. The notice indicated the Claimant's FIP case was closing due to the Claimant exceeding the Federal time limit of 60 months.

6. On May 13, 2013, the Claimant requested a hearing to dispute the FIP closure.

### **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).

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. BEM 234 and MCL 400.57a (4) restrict the total cumulative months that an individual may receive FIP benefits to a lifetime limit of 60 months for cash assistance program benefits funded with temporary assistance for needy families whether or not those months are consecutive.

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 presented sufficient credible testimony and documentary evidence at the hearing establishing that, as of March 2013, the Claimant had received at least 60 months of federally funded assistance.

I have carefully considered and weighed the testimony and other evidence in the record and finds the Department has met its burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that the Claimant has reached or exceeded the lifetime limit of 60 months for cash assistance program benefits funded with temporary assistance for needy families.

Therefore, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, I conclude the Department properly closed the Claimant's FIP case.

**DECISION AND ORDER**

I find, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, the Department did act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's FIP eligibility determination is **AFFIRMED**.



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

Date Signed: June 21, 2013

Date Mailed: June 24, 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.

2013-48033/CAA

Request must be submitted through the local DHS office or directly to MAHS by mail at  
Michigan Administrative Hearings  
Recons      ideration/Rehearing Request  
P. O. Box 30639  
Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

CAA/las

cc:

