

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No: 201340162
Issue No: 1021
Case No: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: May 15, 2013
Ingham County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Suzanne D. Sonneborn

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon Claimant's request for a hearing received by the Department of Human Services (department) on April 1, 2013. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on May 15, 2013. Claimant appeared and provided testimony. The department was represented by [REDACTED], a family independence specialist with the department's Ingham County office.

ISSUE

Whether the Department properly determined that the Claimant had exceeded the lifetime limit on Family Independence Program (FIP) benefits?

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

1. At all times relevant to this hearing, Claimant was a recipient of FIP benefits.
2. On March 20, 2013, the department informed Claimant that, effective May 2013, his FIP benefits case would be closed for the reason that, as of March 1, 2010, his group had received 60 months or more of federally-funded FIP benefits, which is the time allowed for eligibility. (Department Exhibit 1)
3. On April 1, 2013, Claimant submitted a hearing request, wherein Claimant disputes the department's closure of his FIP benefits.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Clients have the right to contest a Department decision affecting eligibility for benefit levels whenever it is believed that the decision is incorrect. The Department Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 600 (February 1, 2013). The Department will provide an administrative hearing to review the decision and determine the appropriateness of that decision. BAM 600. The regulations governing the hearing and appeal process for applicants and recipients of public assistance in Michigan are found in the Michigan Administrative Code (Mich Admin Code), R 400.901-400.951. An opportunity for a hearing shall be granted to an applicant who requests a hearing because the claim for assistance is denied. Mich Admin Code, R 400.903(1).

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 administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3101 through R 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996. Department policies are contained in BAM, the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

The FIP benefit program is not an entitlement. BEM 234 (January 1, 2013). Time limits are essential to establishing the temporary nature of aid as well as communicating the FIP philosophy to support a family's movement to self-sufficiency. BEM 234.

BEM 234 restricts the total cumulative months that an individual may receive FIP benefits to a lifetime limit of 48 months for state-funded FIP cases and 60 months for those cases funded by federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funds. Notwithstanding the 48-month lifetime limit for state-funded FIP cases, a family is not eligible to receive FIP assistance beyond 60 consecutive or non-consecutive TANF months. BEM 234. Federally-funded TANF countable months began to accrue for FIP on October 1, 1996. BEM 234.

Testimony and other evidence must be weighed and considered according to its reasonableness. *Gardiner v Courtright*, 165 Mich 54, 62; 130 NW 322 (1911); *Dep't of Community Health v Risch*, 274 Mich App 365, 372; 733 NW2d 403 (2007). Moreover, the weight and credibility of this evidence is generally for the fact-finder to determine. *Dep't of Community Health*, 274 Mich App at 372; *People v Terry*, 224 Mich App 447, 452; 569 NW2d 641 (1997). In evaluating the credibility and weight to be given the testimony of a witness, the fact-finder may consider the demeanor of the witness, the reasonableness of the witness's testimony, and the interest, if any, the witness may have in the outcome of the matter. *People v Wade*, 303 Mich 303 (1942), *cert den*, 318 US 783 (1943).

In this case, the department presented evidence at the May 15, 2013 hearing establishing that, as of March 1, 2010, Claimant had received 60 months of federally-funded FIP benefits. Claimant testified that he did not disagree that he had reached his allowed limit of federally-funded FIP benefits.

This Administrative Law Judge has carefully considered and weighed the testimony and other evidence in the record and finds the computer-generated printout provided by the department, establishing the 62 months in which Claimant received federally-funded FIP benefits, to be persuasive. Consequently, this Administrative Law Judge finds the department has met its burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that the Claimant reached or exceeded the lifetime limit of 60 months for federally-funded FIP benefits.

Accordingly, the Administrative Law Judge finds that, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence presented during the hearing, the department acted in accordance with policy in closing Claimant's FIP benefits case effective April 1, 2013 for the reason that Claimant reached the 60-month limit of federally-funded FIP assistance and was therefore no longer eligible to receive such assistance pursuant to BEM 234.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the department acted in accordance with policy in closing Claimant's FIP benefits case for the reason that Claimant reached the 60-month limit of federally-funded FIP assistance and was therefore no longer eligible to receive such assistance pursuant to BEM 234.

/s/ _____
Suzanne D. Sonneborn
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: May 15, 2013

Date Mailed: May 16, 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.

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 affect the substantial rights of Claimant;
 - the failure of the ALJ to address other relevant issues in the hearing decision.

A request for rehearing or reconsideration 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

SDS/aca

cc:

