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

#### IN THE MATTER OF:



2013-59848
1038
August 28, 2
Jackson

2013

### 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 Claim ant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on A ugust 28, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participant s on behalf of Claimant included Participants on behalf of Department mily Independence Manager (FIM) of Human Services (Department) included Fa and PATH Worker,

#### ISSUE

Did the Departm ent properly  $\Box$  deny Claiman t's application  $\boxtimes$  close Claimant's case for:

X	

Family Independence Program (FIP)?

Food Assistance Program (FAP)?

Medical Assistance (MA)?

Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)?

State Disability Assistance (SDA)?

Child Development and Care (CDC)?

### FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based on t he competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. Cla imant applied for benefits received benefits for:

X	
	1
	4

Family Independence Program (FIP). Food Assistance Program (FAP).

Medical Assistance (MA).

Adult Medical Assistance (AMP).

State Disability Assistance (SDA).

- Child Development and Care (CDC).
- 2. Per the Department's hearing summary (as there is no DHS-1605, Notice of Case Action in evidence) on August 1, 2013, the Department denied Claimant's application 🖂 closed Claimant's FI P case due to non-compliance with employment related activities.

- 3. Per the Department's hearing summary (as there is no DHS-1605, Notice of Case Action in evidence) on July 10, 2013, the Department sent 

  Claimant's Authoriz ed Repres entative (AR) notice of the 

  denial. 

  FIP closure.
- 4. On July 26, 2013, Claimant f iled a hearing r equest, protesting the ☐ denial of the application. ⊠ FIP closure.

## CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Department policies are contained in the Br idges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established purs uant to the Personal Responsibility and W ork Opportunity Reconc iliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 42 USC 601, *et seq*. The Department (formerly k nown 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 Assistanc e Program (FAP) [for merly 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 Ass istance (MA) program is es tablished by the Title XIX of the Soc ial Security Act and is im plemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independ ence Agency) administers the MA pr ogram pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq*., and MC L 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 Disabilit y Assistance (SDA) progr am, which provides financial ass istance for disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The D epartment 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 establis hed by Titles IVA, IVE and XX of the Soc ial Security Act, the Ch ild Care and Developm ent 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 Fede ral Regulations, Parts 98 and 99. The Depart ment provides servic es to adults and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and 1999 AC, R 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.

The Claimant in this case testified that she had participated with Work First by attending school. She was nev er informed by her W ork First Worker, that she had to provide any logs. Indeed, the Claimant testified that admitted that this was her mistak e and she had intended to correct it, but then she went on sick leaver. The Department was asked to respond to the Claimant's testimony and said she could not, as she has no personal knowledge of those conversations and the could not be conversed out on leave.

Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM ) 233A (2012), pp. 8, 9, provide that the DHS-2444 Notice of N on-compliance state the date/ dates of the C laimant's non-compliance and the reason why the Claimant was determined to be non-compliant. In this case, the DHS-2444, Notice of non-compliance, sent July 10, 2013, gives the Claimant notice that she was non-compliant because of a miss ed appointment/meeting. The Department, however, testified that the Claimant was non-compliant because she submitted no logs for 3 week s. The DHS-2444, Notice of N on-compliance at notice scheduled a triage meeting for July 16, 2013. When asked she did not attend, the Claimant testified that she only ever received the notic e on July 17, 2013. Similarly, she only received the notice of an appointment sent July 3, 2013, on July 11, 2013. The Department testified that the DHS-2444, Notice of Non-compliance is sent to Lans ing and then sent to t he Claimant.

The Claimant's testimony is found to be credible and persuasive. From her interaction with Work First on July 11, 2013 and even on her hearing request, the Claimant has consistently maintained that she was not in formed that she had to submit job logs and was told that she no longer had to submit school logs. No one at the hearing had any personal k nowledge of the Claimant's assertion. There are no signed orientation documents in the record indicating that the Claimant was informed that she had to submit job logs. Regarding mis sing an appointment, it is entirely plaus ible that the Claimant is getting her notices too late if they are first sent to Lansing and then sent back to her. As such, the evidence does not establish that the Claimant was in no n-compliance with employment related activity.

Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 233A (2013) p. 6, provides that the penalty for noncompliance without good c ause is FIP c ase closure. However, in this case, the Administrative Law J udge determines that the evidence is insufficient to establish that the Claim ant was in non-compliance with em ployment related activities. The Administrative Law Judge therefore concludes that when the Department took action t o close the Claimant's FIP case, the Department was not acting in accordance with it s 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
properly closed Claimant's case		improperly closed Claim ant's case for:
AMP 🖾 FIP 🗌 FAP 🗌 MA 🗌 SDA 🗌	C	DC.

# DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law finds that the Department  $\Box$  did act properly.  $\boxtimes$  did not act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's AMP X FIP FAP AA SDA CDC decision is AFFIRMED **REVERSED**.

THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO DO THE FOLLOWING WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER:

1. Initiate action to reinstate the Claimant's FIP case, and

2. Initiate action to issue the Claimant any supplement she may thereafter be due.

/s/

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

Date Signed: August 29, 2013

Date Mailed: August 29, 2013

**NOTICE:** Michigan Administrative Hearing Syst em (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 Dec ision and Order. MAHS will not or der a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's mo tion where the final decis ion 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 ti mely 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 errors, or other obvious errors in the hearing decision that effect the substantial rights of the claimant:
- the failure of the ALJ to address ot her relevant iss ues in the hearing decision.

Request must be submitted through the local DHS office or directly to MAHS by mail at Michigan Administrative hearings

Recons ideration/Rehearing Request

P. O. Box 30639 Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

# SEH/tb

