


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



**IN THE MATTER OF:**



Reg. No.: 201363174  
Issue No.: 3000; 3008  
Case No.:   
Hearing Date: October 7, 2013  
County: Wayne (35)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Robert J. Chavez

**HEARING DECISION**

Following Claimant's request for a hearing, this matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and 400.37; 7 CFR 273.15 to 273.18; 42 CFR 431.200 to 431.250; 45 CFR 99.1 to 99.33; and 45 CFR 205.10. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on October 7, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included . Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included .


**ISSUE**

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

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP)?        | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA)? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC)?  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA)?                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Direct Support Services (DSS)?     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)?           | <input type="checkbox"/> State SSI Payments (SSP)?          |

**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  received:  
 FIP  FAP  MA  AMP  SDA  CDC  DSS  SSP benefits.
2. On  2013, the Department  denied Claimant's application  closed Claimant's case

due to failure to meet residency requirements and a paternity non-cooperation.

3. On [REDACTED] 2013, the Department sent Claimant/Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) its decision.
4. On [REDACTED] 2013, Claimant/Claimant's Authorized Hearing Representative (AHR) filed a hearing request, protesting the Department's actions.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

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

The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, PL 104-193, and 42 USC 601 to 679c. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10 and 400.57a and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3101 to .3131.

The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp program] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, 7 USC 2011 to 2036a and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in 7 CFR 271.1 to 285.5. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10 and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001 to .3015.

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social Security Act, 42 USC 1396-1396w-5, and is implemented by 42 CFR 400.200 to 1008.59. The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10 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.

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program is established by the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1-.119b. The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10 and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3151-.3180.

The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE and XX of the Social Security Act, 42 USC 601-619, 670-679c, and 1397-1397m-5; the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 1990, PL 101-508, 42 USC 9858 to 9858q; and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, PL 104-193. The program is implemented by 45 CFR 98.1-99.33. The Department

administers the program pursuant to MCL 400.10 and provides services to adults and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and Mich Admin Code, R 400.5001-.5020.

Direct Support Services (DSS) is established by the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1-.119b. The program is administered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10 and 400.57a and Mich Admin Code R 400.3603.

The State SSI Payments (SSP) program is established by 20 CFR 416.2001-.2099 and the Social Security Act, 42 USC 1382e. The Department administers the program pursuant to MCL 400.10.

After opening the record, the Department admitted error in the current case, and stated affirmatively that steps were required to correct the action taken with regards to claimant's benefit case. Therefore, no other findings are necessary.

In the current case, the Department testified that it must reopen FAP benefits retroactive to the date of negative action provided that the claimant returns a permanent residence card in order to correct the action taken with regard to claimant's current benefits case. The Administrative Law Judge therefore holds that the Department must take the action stated.

However, there was also a paternity noncooperation on claimant's benefit case, preventing FAP benefits from restoration.

Regulations governing the Office of Child Support (OCS) can be found in the Office of Child Support Policy Manual (OCSPM).

Clients must comply with all requests for action or information needed to establish paternity and/or obtain child support on behalf of children for whom they receive assistance, unless a claim of good cause for not cooperating has been granted or is pending. Failure to cooperate without good cause results in disqualification. Disqualification includes member removal, denial of program benefits, and/or case closure, depending on the program. BEM 255.

Noncooperation exists when the custodial parent (CP) does not respond to a request for action or does not provide information, and the process to establish paternity and/or a child support order cannot move forward without the CP's participation. A CP is in noncooperation with the IV-D program when the CP, without good cause, willfully and repeatedly fails or refuses to provide information and/or take an action needed to establish paternity or to obtain child support or medical support. OCSPM 2.15. IV-D staff apply noncooperation to a CP only as a last resort when no other option is available to move the IV-D case forward. OCSPM 2.3.

There is no minimum information requirement. CPs can be required to provide known or obtainable information about themselves, the child(ren) for whom support is sought, and the non-custodial parent (NCP) when needed to obtain support. OCSPM 2.3.1.

In evaluating cooperation, the IV-D worker should consider such factors as the CP's marital status, the duration of his/her relationship with the NCP, and the length of time since the CP's last contact with the NCP. OCSPM 2.3.1.

A CP can be required to cooperate by attesting under oath to the lack of information regarding an NCP. This may assist in determining cooperation in cases in which a CP's willingness to cooperate is questionable but there is insufficient evidence for a finding of noncooperation. The IV-D worker is not required to provide a CP with the opportunity to attest under oath if the CP has not demonstrated a willingness and good-faith effort to provide information. In this situation, the IV-D worker must evaluate whether the CP has knowingly withheld information or given false information, and base a decision on that evidence. OCSPM 2.3.5.

With regard to the child support noncooperation sanction, no evidence was presented that this sanction was correct. The only evidence presented with regard to the accuracy of the sanction was a negative action notice showing that the claimant was under sanction—this notice cannot be used to prove itself. None of this evidence shows exactly why claimant is under a sanction, whether claimant has actually failed to cooperate, or how claimant is noncooperative.

Furthermore, claimant testified that the child that OCS is seeking a noncooperation penalty for is not claimant's daughter. Given that claimant is currently 66 years old and the child in question is 14 lends credibility to claimant's statement.

Simply put, the Administrative Law Judge has received no evidence as to whether the sanction is accurate, why claimant was sanctioned, whether a sanction is warranted, or if claimant even requires child support that would support a sanction. OCS did not testify, and no other evidence regarding the sanction was presented; therefore, as the Department has the burden of proof in these matters, the sanction cannot stand.

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, if any, finds that the Department

- acted in accordance with Department policy when it .
- did not act in accordance with Department policy when it closed claimant's FAP case.
- failed to satisfy its burden of showing that it acted in accordance with Department policy when it .

**DECISION AND ORDER**


Accordingly, the Department's decision is

- AFFIRMED.
- REVERSED.

AFFIRMED IN PART with respect to \_\_\_\_\_ and REVERSED IN PART with respect to \_\_\_\_\_.

THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO BEGIN DOING THE FOLLOWING, IN ACCORDANCE WITH DEPARTMENT POLICY AND CONSISTENT WITH THIS HEARING DECISION, WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER:

1. Reopen FAP benefits retroactive to the date of negative action provided that the claimant returns a permanent residence card.
2. Remove the paternity noncooperation sanction on claimant's benefit case.



**Robert J. Chavez**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 10/16/2013

Date Mailed: 10/16/2013

**NOTICE OF APPEAL:** 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 or Reconsideration was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the Decision and Order of Reconsideration or Rehearing Decision.

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).

A Request for Rehearing or Reconsideration may be granted when one of the following exists:

- Newly discovered evidence that existed at the time of the original hearing that could affect the outcome of the original hearing decision;
- Misapplication of manual policy or law in the hearing decision which led to a wrong conclusion;
- Typographical, mathematical or other obvious error in the hearing decision that affects the rights of the client;
- Failure of the ALJ to address in the hearing decision relevant issues raised in the hearing request.

The Department, AHR or the claimant must specify all reasons for the request. MAHS will not review any response to a request for rehearing/reconsideration. A request must be *received* in MAHS within 30 days of the date the hearing decision is mailed.

The written request must be faxed to (517) 335-6088 and be labeled as follows:

2013-63174/RJC

Attention: MAHS Rehearing/Reconsideration Request

If submitted by mail, the written request must be addressed as follows:

Michigan Administrative Hearings  
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request  
P.O. Box 30639  
Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

RJC/hw

cc:

