## IN THE MATTER OF:



| Reg. No.: | $2013-41866$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Issue No.: | 6019 |
| Case No.: |  |
| Hearing Date:  <br> County:  |  |
|  |  |

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 from $\quad$ Michigan. Participants 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 $\boxtimes$ close Claimant's case $\square$ reduce Claimant's benefits for:


## 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 $\square$ applied for benefits for: $\boxtimes$ received benefits for:
$\square$ Family Independence Program (FIP).
$\square$ Food Assistance Program (FAP).
$\square$ Medical Assistance (MA).
$\square$ Adult Medical Assistance (AMP).
State Disability Assistance (SDA).
Q Child Development and Care (CDC).
2. Or , the Department $\square$ denied Claimant's application
$\boxtimes$ closed Claimant's case $\square$ reduced Claimant's benefits due to excess income.
3. On , the Department sent
$\boxtimes$ Claimant $\square$ Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the $\quad \square$ denial. $\boxtimes$ closure. $\square$ reduction.
4. On , the Department received the Claimant's hearing request, protesting the $\square$ denial of the application. $\boxtimes$ closure of the case. $\square$ 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 income, the Department $\quad$ properly $\square$ improperlydenied Claimant's application reduced Claimant's benefits
closed Claimant's case
for: $\square$ AMP $\qquad$ FIP $\square$ FAP $\square$ MA SDA $\boxtimes C D C$.

## 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
$\boxtimes$ did act properly $\quad \square$ did not act properly.
Accordingly, the Department's $\square$ AMP $\square$ FIP $\square$ FAP $\square$ MA $\square$ SDA $\boxtimes$ CDC decision is $\boxtimes$ AFFIRMED $\square$ REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.

Kevin Scully
Administrative Law Judge
For Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services
Date Signed: $\underline{05 / 30 / 2013}$
Date Mailed: $\underline{05 / 30 / 2013}$
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.

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.

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/kI
cc:


