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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg.No. Issue No. Case No. Hearing Date: 2013 38897 1038

January 10, 2013 Wayne County DHS (18)

## ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Lynn M. Ferris

# HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon the c laimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on January 10, 2013 from Detroit, Michigan The Claimant appeared and testified. Assistance Payments Supervisor, appeared on behalf of the Department.

### ISSUE

Whether the Department correctly sanc tioned and closed the Claimant's cash assistance (FIP) for noncompliance with work-related activities without good cause.

## FINDINGS OF FACT

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

- 1. The Claim ant was assigned to attend the work first program and did not attend August 13, 2012.
- 2. The Claimant attended the orientation but did not remain at the orientation.
- 3. The Department held a triage by tel ephone on September 6, 2012 and at the triage the Claimant stated that she had to take her medications and that the work first program would not allow her to take her medications during the program.
- 4. The Claimant did not return to work first after orientation.

- 5. The Department request ed t hat the c laimant pr ovide additional medical information in support of her non-att endance but did not send the Claimant a Medical Needs form.
- 6. The Department sent a notice of noncompliance to the Claimant on August 25, 2012. T he Notice s cheduled a triage for September 6, 2012. The Notice indicated the noncompliance due to failu re to parti cipate in the Jet program noting no initial contact with MWA (Michigan Works Agency). Exhibit D
- 7. The Department sanctioned and closed the Claimant's FIP case effective October 1, 2012 for 3 months when it found no good cause because Claimant had not provided any additional medical information.
- 8. No individual from the work first program or from the department who attended the triage attended the hearing.
- 9. The Claimant requested a hearing on October 29, 2012 protesting the closure of her FIP cash assistance and the imposition of a 3 month sanction.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Family Independence Program ("FIP") was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opport unity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 8 USC 60 1, *et seq.* The Department of Human Services ("D HS" or "Department"), formerly known as the Family Independence Agency, administers the FIP program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq* and Michigan Administrative Code Rules 400.3101-3131. Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual ("BAM"), the Bridges Eligibility Manual ("BEM"), and the Bridges Reference Manual ("BRM").

DHS requires clients to participat e in employ ment and self-sufficiency related activities and to ac cept employment when offered. BEM 233A All Work E ligible Individuals ("WEI") as a condition of e ligibility must engage in employment and/or self-sufficiency related activities. BEM 233A The WEI is consid ered non-c ompliant f or failing or refusing to appear and participate with the Jobs, Education, and Training Program ("JET") or other employment service provider. BEM 233A Good cause is a valid reas on for noncompliance with employment and/or self-sufficiency related activities that are based on factors that are beyond the control of the noncompliant person. BEM 233A Failure to comply without good cause results in FIP c losure. BEM 233A T he second occurrences of non-compliance results in a 6 month FIP closur e. BEM 233A The thir d occurrence results in a lifetime disqualification from receiving FIP benefits.

JET participants will not be te rminated from a JET program without first scheduling a triage meeting with the client to jointly discuss noncompliance and good cause. BEM

233A In processing a FIP cl osure, the Department is r equired to send the client a notice of non-compliance, DH S-2444, which must include the date(s) of the noncompliance: the reason the client was determined to be non-compliant; and the penalty duration. BEM 233A In addit ion, a triage must be hel d within the negative actio n period. BEM 233A A good caus e determination is made during the triage and prior to the negative action effective date. BEM 233A. However, a failure to participate can be overcome if the client has good cause. Good cause is a valid reason for failing to participate with employm ent and/or self-suffi ciency-related activities that are based on factors that are beyond the control of the claimant . BEM 233A. The penalty for noncompliance is FIP closure. Ho wever, a failure to participate can be overcome if the client h as good ca use. Good c ause is a va lid reaso n for failin g to participate with employment and/or s elf-sufficiency-related activities that are bas ed on factors that are beyond the control of the claimant. BEM 2 33A. The penalty for noncompliance is FIP closure.

In this case, the Claimant was assigned to attend work first and after orientation did attend for part of the time and then left. The Cl aimant credibly testified that at the time of the orientation she was taking chemother apy drugs and that t he work fir st program personnel advised her that she could not take her medications and attend the program.

Subsequently the Department had a phone triage with the Claimant and asked the Claimant to provide medical inf ormation to support her medic al condition regarding chemotherapy. The Department did not send the Claimant a medical needs form requesting that additional information be provided. Subsequently, the Department closed the Claimant's case because no additional medical in formation was provided by Claimant.

As I find the claimant's testimony regarding the work first program advising her that she could not take her medications while attending the program credible, I find that this reason for leaving est ablished good cause for her non-attendance. No one from the work first program was in attendance at the hearing to dispute the Claimant's assertion and thus the program prevented her from continuing to attend which was a situation not within her control.

Additionally, I find that the Claim ant also should have been sent a medical needs form or other request for medical ve rification of her medical condition and the effects of her chemotherapy. BEM 230 A requires that for s hort term incapacity (less than 90 days) verification must be obtained by obtaining a medical needs form. Additionally for longer incapacity or when an MRT decision has already been issued and the Cla imant is claiming a new medic al condition, new veri fications are to be obtained. Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 230 A pp. 11 and pp.13 (1/2013)

The Department should have also cons idered BEM 233 A, p 8 whic h requires a planning triage when an individual has been reviewed by MRT and found t o be work ready with limitations but is noncompliant with work-related activities.

Therefore, it is determined based upon the evidence presented at the hearing and the testimony of the parties t hat the Department did not co mply with department policy regarding the requirements obt aining addional medic al veri fication with re gard to the Claimant's medical conditions and did not pr ovide a medical needs form and that the Claimant was prohibit ed from attending t he work fir st program due to the program sending her away because of her need to take medications while in attendance.

Based of the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and for the reasons stated on the record at the hearing, the testimony of witnesses and the documentary evidence received, the Department has not demonstrated that it correctly followed and applied Department policy in closin g and sanctioning the Claim ant's FIP case for noncompliance without good cause and therefor e also improperly imposed a 3 month sanction. BEM 230 A and BEM 233A

#### 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 r ecord, finds that the D epartment did not act properly when it closed the Claimant's FIP case and imposed a 3 month sanction.

Accordingly, the Department's	AMP	🛛 FIP	🗌 FAP	🗌 MA	SDA 🗌	
decision is REVERSED for the	reasons s	stated on	the record	and in th	nis Decisio	on.

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the reco rd and in this Decision finds that the Department

 $\Box$  did act properly when .  $\Box$  did not act properly when it closed Claimant's FIP case and imposed a 3 month sanction.

Accordingly, the Department's	AMP	🛛 FIP	🗌 FAP	🗌 MA	🗌 SDA	
decision is 🗌 AFFIRMED 🖂 F	REVERSE	D for the	reasons	stated on	the record	d and as
setforth in this Decision.						

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

1. The Department shall initiate reinstatement of the Claimant's FIP case retroactive to the date of closure October 1, 2012.

- 2. The Department shall iss ue a supplement to the Claimant for any FIP benefits she was otherwise entitled to receive as a re sult of the i mproper closure based upon noncompliance with work first participation without good case.
- 3. The Department shall remove the 3 month s anction it imposed for non-participation with work first from the Claimant's case record and the Department's records.
- 4. The Department shall provide the Claim ant a medical needs for m which is to be completed and processed to determine if t he Claimant must attend the work first program based upon her current medical condition.

Lynn M. Ferris

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

Date Signed: January 16, 2013

Date Mailed: January 16, 2013

**NOTICE:** Michigan Administrative Hearing Syst em (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 order 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 <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 Re consideration/Rehearing Request

Re consideration/Rehearing Reque P. O. Box 30639 Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

LMF/cl

