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:	June 27, 2013 Kent		
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 June 27, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included Family Independence Manager, and Case Manager,				
<u>ISSUE</u>				
Did the Department properly \square deny Claimant's application \boxtimes close Claimant's case for:				
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)?☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)?☐ Medical Assistance (MA)?		sistance (AMP)? ssistance (SDA)? ent 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:				
Claimant ☐ applied for benefits ⊠ received benefits for:				
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP).☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP).☐ Medical Assistance (MA).	State Disability A	ssistance (AMP). Assistance (SDA). ent and Care (CDC).		

2.	On June 1, 2013 the Department denied Claimant's application due to non-compliance with employment related activities.
3.	On May 20, 2013, the Department sent Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the denial. Closure.
4.	On May 29, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the ☐ denial of the application. ☐ closure.
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
	partment policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the dges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).
Re 42 Ag thr	The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal sponsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence ency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, R 400.3101 ough Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program ective October 1, 1996.
pro imp Re Ag	The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) ogram] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is plemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal gulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence ency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, R 400.3001 ough Rule 400.3015.
Se Th Ag	The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social curity Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). e Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence ency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MCL 0.105.
	The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is ministered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq.
for Se pro	The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human rvices (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA ogram pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 2000 AACS, R 400.3151 through Rule 0.3180.

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, it was not contested that the Claimant did not complete the PATH orientation. The Claimant testified that she had left her with her who telephoned the Claimant to report that the was continuously crying and would not accept a bottle. The Claimant testified that, up to this point, the had been breast-fed and the Claimant never anticipated such a problem, so she left PATH to attend to the the left problem. The Department testified that no good cause was found as the Claimant presented no verification of her claims and further, no good cause would likely have been found without some statement of medical necessity that she attend to the				
It is not contested that the Claimant did not complete her scheduled PATH orientation and was therefore in non-compliance with PATH. The Claimant asserts she had good cause due to her distress on this day. Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 233A (2013) p. 6 provides that a claim of good cause must be verified. To date, the Claimant does still not have verification of her claims. She presented nothing for verification of those claims and did not assert that she had verification of her claimants at her triage telephone conference. BEM 233A p. 6, provides that the penalty for noncompliance without good cause is FIP case closure. The Administrative Law Judge therefore concludes that when the Department took action to close the Claimant's FIP case, the Department was 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				
☐ properly denied Claimant's application ☐ improperly denied Claimant's application ☐ 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 finds that the Department ☐ did act properly. ☐ did not act properly.				

Accordingly, the Department's $igsqcup$,	SDA CDC decision
is ⊠ AFFIRMED ☐ REVERSED.	 _

<u>/S/</u>

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

Date Signed: <u>07/01/2013</u>

Date Mailed: 07/01/2013

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 <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/sw

CC:

