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

IN	THE	MΔ.	TTFF	R OF:
114	INE	IVIA	IIEI	۱UF.

	Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	201341136 1038; 3029 May 16, 2013 Macomb 12			
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 May 16, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included  Behalf of Claimant included  Compared to the compared to					
<u>ISSUE</u>					
Did the Department properly $\square$ deny Claimant's application $\boxtimes$ close Claimant's case for:					
<ul><li>☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)?</li><li>☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)?</li><li>☐ Medical Assistance (MA)?</li></ul>		sistance (AMP)? ssistance (SDA)? ent and Care (CDC)?			
Did the Department properly  deny Clain case for:	nant's application 🛚	sanction Claimant's			
Family Independence Program (FIP)?  Food Assistance Program (FAP)?  Medical Assistance (MA)?		sistance (AMP)? ssistance (SDA)?			

through Rule 400.3015.

## **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: Family Independence Program (FIP). Adult Medical Assistance (AMP). Food Assistance Program (FAP). State Disability Assistance (SDA). Medical Assistance (MA). Child Development and Care (CDC). 2. On May 1, 2013, the Department denied Claimant's application Closed Claimant's FIP case due to non-compliance with employment related activities. 3. On May 1, 2013, the Department denied Claimant's application due to non-compliance with employment related activities. 4. On March 25, 2013, the Department sent Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the denial. | | FIP closure and FAP sanction. 5. On April 10, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the  $\square$  denial of the application.  $\square$  FIP closure and FAP sanction. 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 seg. 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

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, <i>et seq.</i> , 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, <i>et seq</i> .
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, <i>et seq.</i> , 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 DHS-2444, Notice of Non-compliance indicates that the Claimant was non-compliant as she missed an appointment on March 25, 2013, and the Department FIS present at the hearing initially testified consistent with that. It is not contested that the Claimant did not attend the triage meeting scheduled for April 2, 2013. The Claimant credibly testified that she telephoned the FIS, on March 28, 2013 and March 29, 2013 and to tell her that she could not make that triage time and to request a telephone triage. The Claimant credibly testified that she left messages on the voicemail and on March 29, 2013, she also telephoned the FIS's supervisor and left a message on that voice mail as well.

By the end of the hearing the FIS then testified that date of non-compliance on the notice was inaccurate and that the Claimant had missed the appointment much earlier than March 25, 2013. Eventually, the FIS conceded that the Claimant did not have proper notice of the appointment because the appointment notice was mailed to an address which was not the Claimant's address.

Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 233A (2013) p. 7 provides, in pertinent part, that a Claimant can either attend a meeting or participate in a conference call if attendance at the triage meeting is not possible. If a Claimant calls to reschedule an already scheduled triage meeting, offer a phone conference at that time. In this case, had the Claimant's telephone messages been returned and had she been afforded a triage as policy requires, the FIS would have known at that time that the Claimant had no proper notice of her appointment. Therefore, when the FIS took action to close the Claimant's FIP case and sanction her FAP case, the Department was not acting in accordance with its policy.

Based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law the Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department
<ul> <li>□ properly denied Claimant's application</li> <li>□ properly closed Claimant's case</li> <li>□ AMP □ FIP □ FAP □ MA □ SDA □ CDC.</li> </ul>
Based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law the Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department
☐ properly denied Claimant's application ☐ improperly denied Claimant's application ☐ properly closed Claimant's case ☐ improperly sanctioned 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 finds that the Department $\square$ did act properly. $\boxtimes$ did not act properly.
Accordingly, the Department's $\square$ AMP $\boxtimes$ FIP $\boxtimes$ FAP $\square$ MA $\square$ SDA $\square$ CDC decision is $\square$ AFFIRMED $\boxtimes$ REVERSED.
$\  \  \  \  \  \  \  \  \  \  \  \  \  $
<ol> <li>Initiate action to reinstate the Claimant's FIP case and remove the Claimant's FAP sanction back to the closure date, and</li> <li>Initiate action to issue the Claimant any supplements she may thereafter be due.</li> </ol>
<u>/s/</u>
Susanne E. Harris Administrative Law Judge
For Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services
Date Signed: <u>5/22/13</u>
Date Mailed: 5/22/13

**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 <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: