

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 201328819  
Issue No.: 1038  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: March 19, 2013  
County: Saginaw

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Susanne E. Harris

**HEARING DECISION**

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 following Claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on March 19, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED], DHS Triage Specialist; [REDACTED], DHS JET Coordinator; [REDACTED], MWA Triage Specialist.

**ISSUE**

Did the Department properly  deny Claimant's application  close Claimant's case for:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)?    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP)?                | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA)? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA)?                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC)?  |

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

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

1. Claimant  applied for benefits  received benefits for:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP). | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP).    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP).                | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA). |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA).                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC).  |

2. On March 1, 2013, the Department  denied Claimant's application  closed Claimant's case due to her non-compliance with employment related activities.

3. On January 23, 2013, the Department sent  
 Claimant       Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)  
notice of the       denial.     closure.
4. On February 5, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the  
 denial of the application.     closure of the case.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

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

The Family Independence Program (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 (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.

The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) program] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 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 Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105.

The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is administered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 2000 AACS, R 400.3151 through Rule 400.3180.

The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE and XX of the Social Security Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 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 and 99. The Department provides services to adults and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and 1999 AC, R 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.

In this case, the Department testified that the Claimant was non-compliant because she missed an appointment on December 27, 2012. The Claimant testified that she was moving and that the appointment, "[REDACTED]." Later, the Claimant changed her testimony and stated that she could not make the appointment as she was in [REDACTED] from being [REDACTED] from the [REDACTED] five days before the appointment. The Claimant's testimony was not found to be the least bit credible and moving does not constitute good cause under Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 233A (2012), pp. 3-5.

Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 233A (2013), pp. 8, 9, provides 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 DHS-2444, Notice of Non-compliance sent January 23, 2013 gives the Claimant notice that she was non-compliant on January 11, 2013 because of "[REDACTED]". Yet the Department testimony and Department Exhibit 2 indicate that the appointment that the Claimant missed was actually scheduled for December 27, 2012, not January 11, 2013. January 11, 2013 is the date that the Claimant's PATH case worker decided that the Claimant was non-compliant for missing her December 27, 2012 appointment. Though the policy requires that the date/dates of the Claimant's non-compliance be in the DHS-2444 Notice of Non-compliance, the Department workers present at the hearing testified that they had no way of entering that information, as the DHS-2444 Notice of Non-compliance is computer generated.

The Administrative Law Judge concludes that the DHS-2444, Notice of Non-compliance is insufficient in this case because it does not list the date/dates of non-compliance as BEM 233A pp. 8, 9, requires and is therefore simply not in accordance with departmental policy. Furthermore, it does not comport with the concept of due process as it does not inform the Claimant of the date on which she is alleged to have been non-compliant. The Department bears the burden of proving, by a preponderance of the evidence that its actions are in accordance with departmental policy. Here, the Administrative Law Judge determines that the Department was not acting 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 reasons stated on the record, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> properly denied Claimant's application | <input type="checkbox"/> improperly denied Claimant's application     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> properly closed Claimant's case        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> improperly closed Claimant's case |

for:  AMP  FIP  FAP  MA  SDA  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 act properly.  did not act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's  AMP  FIP  FAP  MA  SDA  CDC decision is  AFFIRMED  REVERSED.

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

1. Initiate action to reinstate the Claimant's benefits back to the closure date, and
2. Initiate action to issue the Claimant any supplements she may thereafter be due, and
3. If the Claimant is again found to be in non-compliance with employment related activities, identify the date/dates of the actions or failure to act, as well as the actions or failure to act, which would constitute the Claimant's non-compliance in accordance with BEM 233A, pp. 8, 9.

/s/

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

Date Signed: 3/22/13

Date Mailed: 3/22/13

**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.

201328819/SEH

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:

