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:	201327590 1038 March 7, 2013 Genesee 02		
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Susanne E. Harris				
HEARING DECISION				
This matter is before the undersigned Administra and MCL 400.37 following Claimant's request telephone hearing was held on March 7, 2013, fr behalf of Claimant included Human Services (Department) included Case Ma Co-ordinator , who left approximately here.	for a hearing. om Lansing, Michi articipants on beh anager (CM)	After due notice, a gan. Participants on alf of Department of and Triage		
<u>ISSUE</u>				
Did the Department properly deny Claimant's for:	s application 🛚 cl	ose Claimant's case		
Family Independence Program (FIP)? Food Assistance Program (FAP)? Medical Assistance (MA)?	_	sistance (AMP)? ssistance (SDA)? nt and Care (CDC)?		
FINDINGS OF FACT				
The Administrative Law Judge, based on the evidence on the whole record, finds as material fa		rial, and substantial		
 Claimant ☐ applied for benefits ☐ received benefits for: 				
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP).☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP).☐ Medical Assistance (MA).		ssistance (AMP). Assistance (SDA). ent and Care (CDC).		
2. On March 1, 2013 , the Department ☐ denied Claimant's application ☐ close due to failure to comply with employment relat	d Claimant's case ted activities.			

3.	On January 23, 2013, the Department sent Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the denial. Closure.			
4.	On January 30, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the ☐ denial of the application. ☐ closure of the case.			
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW				
	epartment policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the dges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).			
Re 42 Ag thr	The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal esponsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence ency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, R 400.3101 ough Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program ective October 1, 1996.			
pro imp Re Ag	The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) ogram] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is plemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal egulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence ency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, R 400.3001 ough Rule 400.3015.			
Se Th Ag	The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social curity Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). e Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence ency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MCL 0.105.			
ad	The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is ministered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq.			
for Se pro	The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human rvices (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA ogram pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 2000 AACS, R 400.3151 through Rule 0.3180.			
and 19 Th and	The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE d XX of the Social Security Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 90, and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. e program is implemented by Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 98 d 99. The Department provides services to adults and children pursuant to MCL 0.14(1) and 1999 AC, R 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.			

In this case, The DHS, 2444 sent to Claimant indicates that she is in non-compliance with employment related activities because she did not participate in a required activity on January 23, 2013. The Department could not explain what the Claimant did or did not do that constituted her non-compliance. To the contrary, the Department's Triage Coordinator referenced case notes which were not in evidence and testified that the Claimant has failed, since September of 2012, to put in her required 20 hours of employment related activities.

The hearing summary in evidence indicates that the Claimant's Triage was scheduled for January 30, 2013, but that the Claimant called on January 28, 2013 to reschedule that. The Triage Coordinator testified that, eventually, a telephone triage was scheduled for February 11, 2013 and held on that date.

The Claimant contested that she was in non-compliance. She stated that she had been working at the and she was with others. The people she was with, after they were paid, felt that they were being cheated by the and they walked off the line. She lost her ride to that job. When the Administrative Law Judge questioned the Claimant as to why she did not ask the Department for a bus pass, the Claimant stated that the and no bus runs there.

The Claimant stated that she had spent some time in the and that she was also involved in a statement which she submitted that indicates that she is unable to work. It was at this point that the Administrative Law Judge inquired of the Triage Coordinator as to what occurred at triage and why it was determined that the Claimant had no good cause. CM responded to that by saying that the Triage Coordinator could not answer, as he had left the hearing shortly before the Administrative Law Judge posed her question. CM could not testify as to what happened at the triage, as she was not present nor part of that telephone conversation.

Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 233A (2012), pp. 8, 9, provide that the DHS-2444 Notice of Non-compliance state the date/dates of the Claimant's non-compliance and the reason why the Claimant was determined to be non-compliant. In this case, the Department could not say why the Claimant was determined to be non-compliant on the date specified on the DHS, 2444 Notice of Non-compliance. There are no case notes in the record to support the testimony of the Triage Coordinator which indicated that the Claimant was non-compliant since September of 2012 by failing to complete 20 hours each week, and those dates are not referenced on the DHS, 2444 Notice of Non-compliance. Furthermore, the Claimant asserts that she was compliant and for the instances that she was not, she had good cause. There is no evidence in the record as to what occurred at triage, what the claimant said at triage or why it was determined that the Claimant had no good cause. As such, the evidence is insufficient to establish that the Department acted in accordance with its policy when taking action to close the Claimant's FIP case.

Based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasonstated on the record, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department	ns			
 □ properly denied Claimant's application □ properly closed Claimant's case □ improperly denied Claimant's application □ improperly closed Claimant's case 	on			
for:				
DECISION AND ORDER				
The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusion of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, finds that the Department \square did act properly. \square did not act properly.				
Accordingly, the Department's \square AMP \boxtimes FIP \square FAP \square MA \square SDA \square CDC decis is \square AFFIRMED \boxtimes REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.	on			
☑ THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO DO THE FOLLOWING WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER:				
 Initiate action to reinstate the Claimant's FIP case back to the closure date, an Initiate action to issue the Claimant any supplements she may thereafter be do 				
Susanne E. Hai Administrative Law Jud For Maura Corrigan, Direc Department of Human Service Date Signed: March 18, 2013	lge tor			

Date Mailed: March 20, 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.

201327590/SEH

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 Reconsideration/Rehearing Request P. O. Box 30639 Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

SEH/tb

CC:

