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

#### IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2013-67770 Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:

6021 October 30, 2013

Wayne (82-43)

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Alice C. Elkin

# **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 30, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included

#### ISSUE

Did the Department properly close Claimant's Child Development and Care (CDC) case?

# **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 was an ongoing recipient of CDC benefits on behalf of her two minor wards.
- 2. On August 26, 2013, the Department sent Claimant a Notice of Case Action notifying her that, effective September 8, 2013, her CDC case for both children was closing because she did not have a need for child day care services for reasons of employment, education or family preservation.
- On August 29, 2013, Claimant filed a request for hearing disputing the 3. Department's closure of her CDC case.

# 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), Department of Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT), and Department of Human Services Emergency Relief Manual (ERM).

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.

Additionally, the August 26, 2013, Notice of Case Action notified Claimant that her CDC case was closing effective September 8, 2013, because she lacked a need for CDC services.

The CDC program provides a subsidy for child care services for qualifying families when (i) the parent/substitute parent is unavailable to provide the child care because of employment, participation in an approved activity and/or because of a condition for which treatment is being received and (ii) care is provided by an eligible provider. BEM 703 (July 2013), p. 1.

At the hearing, the Department conceded that Claimant had a valid need for CDC services based on employment and it erroneously closed her CDC case. The Department testified that it had resolved its error on October 9, 2013, by activating CDC coverage for Claimant from June 2, 2013, ongoing. Claimant verified that she was employed from June 2, 2013, through the hearing date. She also verified that she had received CDC benefits for the period beginning June 2, 2013, ongoing.

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, if any, finds that the Department did not act in accordance with Department policy when it closed Claimant's CDC case. Although the undersigned indicated that, based on this, an order reversing the Department would be issued, in light of the evidence establishing that the Department reinstated Claimant's CDC case and provided benefits from June 2, 2013, ongoing, the Department resolved its error in this case.

## DECISION AND ORDER

Accordingly, the Department's decision is AFFIRMED.

Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: October 31, 2013

Date Mailed: October 31, 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:

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

ACE/pf

# 2013-67770/ACE

