## 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: County DHS:										
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Susanne	E. Harris										
HEARING DECISION											
This matter is before the undersigned Admin and MCL 400.37 following Claimant's req telephone hearing was held on on behalf of Claimant included Human Services (Department) included , and											
<u>ISSUE</u>											
Did the Department properly ☐ deny Claim for:	ant's application 🗵 close Claimant's case										
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)? ☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)? ☐ Medical Assistance (MA)?	☐ Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)? ☐ State Disability Assistance (SDA)? ☐ Child Development and Care (CDC)?										
FINDINGS OF FACT											
The Administrative Law Judge, based on evidence on the whole record, finds as mater	•										
1. Claimant ☐ applied for benefits ☒ receiv	ved benefits for:										
<ul> <li>☐ Family Independence Program (FIP).</li> <li>☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP).</li> <li>☐ Medical Assistance (MA).</li> </ul>	<ul><li>☐ Adult Medical Assistance (AMP).</li><li>☐ State Disability Assistance (SDA).</li><li>☐ Child Development and Care (CDC).</li></ul>										
2. On the Department of being eligible for FAP under his mother's	closed Claimant's case due to the Claimant case.										

1990, 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

		Departr 1999 A					ren p	oursua	nt to	MCL
is ca	•	is not o								other's

active FAP case in and that he received benefits under his mother's case. The Claimant testified that he, nor his mother, initiated any action which would have resulted in him being added to his mother's case. The Claimant testified that his told him that this was a "department mother's worker and issue." The Administrative Law Judge asked meant by "department issue," and she said she did not know. Department policy at BEM 222 prohibits the Claimant receiving benefits under two different FAP cases. However, the Claimant's testimony is that neither he, nor his mother, initiated any change that would result in his being placed on his mother's case. The Claimant's mother's case worker was not at the hearing and no explanation was provided regarding why the Claimant's FAP case was closed and he was placed on his mother's FAP case. The evidence is therefore insufficient to establish that the Department acted in accordance with its policy when taking action to close the Claimant's FAP case. Based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law stated on the record. the Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department: properly denied Claimant's application improperly denied Claimant's application ☐ improperly closed Claimant's case properly closed Claimant's case for:  $\square$  AMP  $\square$  FIP  $\boxtimes$  FAP  $\square$  MA  $\square$  SDA  $\square$  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 did not act properly. Accordingly, the Department's AMP FIP FIP FAP MA SDA CDC decision is AFFIRMED X REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.

/s/

Susanne E. Harris
Administrative Law Judge
For Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: <u>02/06/2013</u> Date Mailed: <u>02/06/2013</u> **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 <u>MAY</u> 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

## SEH/kl

cc: