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

 				 	_
J TI		B / A	\ —-	 ~	· — -
	-	11/1 /		 	

	Reg. No.: Issue No(s).: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	2014-3136 1018 November 21, 2013 Macomb #20			
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Michael S. New	ell				
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 November 21, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Sandra Kahill, Jet Worker, and Mary Pennington, Work First Liaison					
<u>ISSUE</u>					
Did the Department properly \boxtimes deny Claimant's a for:	application 🗌 clo	ose Claimant's case			
Food Assistance Program (FAP)?					

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

SSP

1.	Claimant applied for received: FIP FAP MA AMP SDA CDC DSS benefits.
2.	On July 16, 2013, the Department

- 3. On July 31, 2013, the Department sent Claimant/Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) its decision.
- 4. On September 27, 2013, Claimant/Claimant's Authorized Hearing Representative (AHR) filed a hearing request, protesting the Department's actions.
- 5. Sometime before June 3, 2013, Claimant filed for FIP benefits.
- 6. The case was closed due to excess income.
- 7. That closure is not an issue for this hearing.
- 8. On June 3, 2013, Claimant began her 21-day AEP training with Work First.
- 9. On June 14, 2013, work first dismissed Claimant from the program because the Department closed her case due to excess income.
- 10. Claimant reapplied on July 16, 2013, but the Department would not open her claim because she did not complete her AEP training.
- 11. On September 9, 2013, Claimant restarted her AEP training, but Work First closed her case "in error" on September 16, 2013.
- 12. Claimant was not allowed to attend AEP again until October 7, 2013.
- 13. Claimant completed her AEP requirements shortly thereafter.

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 FAF 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 400.1119b. 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 400.31513180.
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 400.50015020.
☐ Direct Support Services (DSS) is established by the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1119b. 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 416.20012099 and the Social Security Act, 42 USC 1382e. The Department administers the program pursuant to MCL 400.10.
Additionally, when Claimant filed her claim on July 16, 2013, she faced the dilemma or catch-22 situation of the Department refusing to open her claim because she did not complete an AEP program that she was not allowed to complete. The Agency's decision in this regard does not make sense. Claimant obviously can't comply with requirements that she's not allowed to comply with.
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
☐ failed to satisfy its burden of showing that it acted in accordance with Department policy when It closed or denied Claimant's application.
DECISION AND ORDER
Accordingly, the Department's decision is
⊠ REVERSED.

- ☑ 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. Reinstate the application dated July 16, 2013 and redetermine eligibility.

Michael S. Newell

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

Michael & Newell

Date Signed: 11/26/2013

Date Mailed: 11/27/2013

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

2014-3136/MSN

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

MN/pw

