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

IN THE MATTER OF:

Reg. No: Issue No: Hearing Date: 2013-48055 1018, 3015

Hearing Date: June 20, 2013

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 following Claim ant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on J une 20, 2013 from Lansing, Mi chigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant inc luded Participant s on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included

#### ISSUE

Did the Department properly reduce the Claimant's F ood Assistance Program (FAP) allotment and deny the Claim ant's Family Independence Program (FIP) application due to excess income?

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

I find as material fact, based on the compet ent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record:

- 1. As of April 2, 2013, the Claimant received FAP benefits.
- 2. On April 2, 2013, the Claimant applied for FIP benefits.
- On April 22, 2013, the Claimant started working at Summit Polymers.
- 4. On May 3, 2013, the Claimant provi ded the Department with her first pay stub.
- 5. On May 7, 2013, the Department budget ed the Claimant's income and determined the Claimant was no longer e ligible for the FIP program and as a result of the income the FAP benefits should be reduced.
- 6. On May 7, 2013, the Depar tment sent the Cla imant a notice of case action. The notice indicated the Claimant's FIP application was being denied and the Claimant's FAP benefits were being reduced effective June 1, 2013 due to excess income.

7. On May 10, 2013, the Claimant requested a hearing in dispute of the FIP denial and FAP reduction.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

Department policies are contained in the Br idges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

The FAP [formerly known as the Food Stamp (F S) program] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in T itle 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, R 400.3001 through Rule 400.3015.

The FIP was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Pu blic 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.

In this case, the Department failed to provi de testimony or exhibits to show how the Department calculated the reduced FAP allotment and failed to provide an explanation on how they calculated the Claimant's income in the FIP budget. Specifically, the Department was missing evidence and testimony regarding the specific determinations regarding the earned income. Therefore, I was unable to determine whether the Department acted in accordance with the applicable laws and policities when they reduced the Claimant's FAP allotment and denied the Claimant's FIP application.

Based upon the abov e Findings of Fact and Conclus ions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, I conclude the Department improperly reduced the Claimant's FAP allotment and improperly denied the Claimant's FIP application.

#### **DECISION AND ORDER**

I find based upon the above F indings of Fa ct and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, the Department did not act properly.

Accordingly, the Dep artment's FAP decis ion 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:

 Initiate a redetermination as to the Claimant's e ligibility f or FAP benefits beginning J une 1, 2013 and is sue retroactive benefits if otherwise qualified and eligible. 2. Initiate a redetermination as to the Claimant's eligibility for FIP benefits beginning May 1, 2013 and is sue retroactive benefits if otherwise qualified and eligible.

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 par ty within 30 days of the mailing date of this Dec ision and Order. MAHS will not or der a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's mo tion where the final decis ion 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 ot her relevant iss ues in the hearing decision.

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

