## 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:	2013-41866 6019 Jackson DHS		
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Kevin Scully				
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 behalf of Claimant included Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included				
ISSUE				
Due to excess income, did the Department properly $\square$ deny the Claimant's application $\square$ close Claimant's case $\square$ reduce Claimant's benefits for:				
Food Assistance Program (FAP)?		sistance (AMP)? ssistance (SDA)? nt and Care (CDC)?		
FINDINGS OF FA	<u>ACT</u>			
The Administrative Law Judge, based on the cevidence on the whole record, finds as material face		rial, and substantial		
Claimant ☐ applied for benefits for: ☐ red	eived benefits for	r:		
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP). ☐ ☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP). ☐ ☐ Medical Assistance (MA). ☑		sistance (AMP). assistance (SDA). ent and Care (CDC).		

2.	On the latest of the Department denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's case reduced Claimant's benefits due to excess income.
3.	Or, the Department sent Claimant is Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the denial closure reduction.
4.	On, the Department received the Claimant's hearing request, protesting the denial of the application. $\boxtimes$ closure of the case reduction of benefits.

## **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 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.

Based on the evidence and testimony available during the hearing, the Department established that the Claimant is not eligible to receive Child Development and Care (CDC) benefits because her income exceeds the income limit established by Department policy.

The Claimant argued that she was not given adequate time to make alternative arrangements for childcare before her benefits were closed.

Case actions that end an authorization without removing a member or close the CDC eligibility determination group (EDG) are not pended. If the ended authorization is not being replaced, or is being replaced with one for fewer hours, the change affects the first CDC pay period that begins on or after the negative action date. Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 220 (November 1, 2012), pp 7-8.

The Department established that it closed the Claimant's Child Development and Care (CDC) case in accordance with policy.

The Claimant testified that she does not dispute the closure of her Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits.

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, due to excess ncome, the Department $\square$ properly $\square$ improperly
<ul> <li>☐ denied Claimant's application</li> <li>☐ reduced Claimant's benefits</li> <li>☐ closed Claimant's case</li> </ul>
for:
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 FAP MA SDA CDC decision s AFFIRMED REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.
/ <u>S/</u> <b>Kevin Scully</b> Administrative Law Judge  For Maura Corrigan, Director  Department of Human Services
Date Signed: 05/30/2013
Date Mailed: <u>05/30/2013</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

## KS/kl

cc: