

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 201350374
Issue No.: 1038; 4070
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: July 3, 2013
County: Berrien

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 July 2, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included Family Independence Manager (FIM), [REDACTED] and Lead Talent Development Specialist from Michigan Works, [REDACTED].

ISSUE

Did the Department properly deny Claimant's application close Claimant's case for:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP)? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Supplemental Payment (SSP)? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development 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:

1. Claimant applied for benefits received benefits for:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP). | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP). |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP). | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Supplemental Payment (SSP). |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA). | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC). |

2. On July 1, 2013, the Department denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's FIP case due to non-compliance with employment related activities.

3. On May 21, 2013, the Department
 denied Claimant's application Closed Claimant's SSP case because she was no longer receiving SSI.
4. On May 21, 2013, the Department sent
 Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)
notice of the denial. FIP and SSP closure.
5. On May 29, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the
 denial of the application. FIP and SSP closure.

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 seq.* 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 through Rule 400.3015.

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, *et seq.*, 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, *et seq.*

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, *et seq.*, 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.

The State Supplementary Security Income program was established pursuant to Title XVI of the Social Security Act in 42 USC 1381, *et seq.*, and implemented by the provisions of Title 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the State SSI program pursuant to 2002 PA 529, MCL 400.10. *et seq.*, and by agreement between the State of Michigan and the United States Secretary of Health and Human Services (Secretary). Department policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Bridges Reference Manual (BRM).

Because the Claimant requested a hearing on both programs on the same day, the Administrative Law Judge has combined the two hearings into one for the convenience of the parties. In this case, the Claimant did not contest that she is no longer receiving SSI. Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 660 (2012) p. 1 provides that the Claimant will be issued SSP benefits only for those months that she receives a regular, first of the month federal SSI benefit. As the Claimant is no longer receiving SSI, the Administrative Law Judge determines that the closure of her SSP case is in accordance with departmental policy.

In this case, the Claimant disputed that she engaged in rude and unprofessional behavior and maintained that she did complete her job log. When asked, the Claimant stated that she did not bring the completed job log to the hearing. When asked why she did not present the completed job log at her triage appointment, the Claimant replied that she had forgotten it at home. The Administrative Law Judge determines that compliance, by definition, would constitute a defense and/or good cause against a claim of non-compliance.

BEM 233A (2013) p. 3 provides that a claim of good cause must be verified. The DHS-2444, Notice of Non-compliance scheduling a triage appointment specifically instructs the Claimant to bring her verification of good cause to that appointment. It is not contested that the Claimant did not bring verification of her completed job search logs to the triage. The Administrative Law Judge finds that the Claimant's assertion that she completed the job search log is less than credible as it is inconsistent with her failure to present such evidence at triage and then again at this hearing. 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, and for the reasons stated on the record, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department properly denied Claimant's application improperly denied Claimant's application properly closed Claimant's case improperly closed Claimant's case for: AMP FIP FAP MA SSP 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 AMP FIP FAP MA SSP CDC decision is **AFFIRMED** REVERSED.

/s/

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

Date Signed: 7/9/13

Date Mailed: 7/9/13

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 **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.

201350374/SEH

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:

