## 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:	201351739 1038 102333471 July 11, 2013 St. Clair		
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 11, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants or behalf of Claimant included human Services (Department) included Family Independence Specialist and JET Coordinator, and PATH Liason				
<u>ISSUE</u>				
Did the Department properly $\square$ deny Claimant's application $\boxtimes$ close Claimant's case for:				
Food Assistance Program (FAP)?		sistance (AMP)? ssistance (SDA)? nt 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:				

Adult Medical Assistance (AMP).

☐ State Disability Assistance (SDA).☐ 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.

Family Independence Program (FIP).

Food Assistance Program (FAP).

Medical Assistance (MA).

3.	On March 25, 2013, the Department sent  Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)  notice of the denial. Closure.
4.	On May 30, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the ☐ denial of the application. ☐ closure.
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
	epartment policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the idges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).
Re 42 Ag thr	The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal esponsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence gency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, R 400.3101 rough Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program fective October 1, 1996.
pro im 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 egulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence gency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, R 400.3001 rough Rule 400.3015.
Se Th Ag	The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social ecurity 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 gency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MCL 10.105.
	The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is lministered 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 ervices (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 10.3180.
an 19 Th an	The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE of XX of the Social Security Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 190, 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 of 99. The Department provides services to adults and children pursuant to MCL 10.14(1) and 1999 AC, R 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.

Date Mailed: 7/15/13

In this case, the Claimant did not contest falsifying her job search logs. She testified that she was busy working and did not know what to write on them. She objected that she had no opportunity for a telephone triage as she did call to request one. She did not contest the Department's testimony that her telephone call was returned and a message was left for her to call back. The Claimant did not contest that she never did call back. When asked why it was that she never did call back for her telephone triage, the Claimant testified, "I wasn't thinking."

Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 233A (2013) p. 2, provides that failure to provide legitimate documentation of work participation constitutes non-compliance. The Claimant did not contest falsifying her job search and as such, the Administrative Law Judge finds that she was in non-compliance with employment related activities. Furthermore, the Claimant does not contest that she never returned the telephone call to have the telephone triage she requested. The Department did therefore properly determined that the Claimant had no good cause for her non-compliance. 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 Judge concludes that the Department  properly d improperly denied Claimant's application properly improperly closed Claimant's case for: AMP For CDC.	enied Claimant's application erly closed Claimant's case
DECISION AND ORDER	
The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Find of Law finds that the Department $\boxtimes$ did act properly.	
Accordingly, the Department's ☐ AMP ☒ FIP ☐ FAP ☐ is ☒ <b>AFFIRMED</b> ☐ REVERSED.	MA SDA CDC decision
/ <u>s/</u> Date Signed: 7/12/13	Susanne E. Harris Administrative Law Judge For Maura Corrigan, Director epartment of Human Services

**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: