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

IN THE MATTER OF:

benefits?



Reg. No.: 2013-28450

Issue No.: 3006

Case No.:

Hearing Date: December 3, 2013

County: Lake

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Carmen G. Fahie

HEARING DECISION

Upon a hearing request by the Department of Human Services (Department) to establish an overissuance (OI) of benefits to Respondent, this matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9, 400.43a, and 24.201, *et seq.*, and Mich Admin Code, R 400.941, and in accordance with 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 Tuesday, December 3, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of the Department included Ginger Motzer, FIM, and Dawn McKay, RS.

Respondent did not appear. This matter having been initiated by the Department

and due notice having been provided t Respondent's absence in accordance with Administrative Manual (BAM) 725, pp. 13-17	n Department of Human Services Bridges	
Participants on behalf of Respondent inc	luded .	
<u>ISSUE</u>		
Did Respondent receive an OI of ☐ Family Independence Program (FIP) ☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)	State Disability Assistance (SDA)Child Development 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:

1.	Respondent was a recipient of $\ \ \Box$ FIP $\ \ \Box$ FAP $\ \ \Box$ SDA $\ \ \Box$ CDC benefits from the Department.	
2.	The Department alleges Respondent received a ☐ FIP ☐ FAP ☐ SDA ☐ CDC Ol during the period October 1, 2011, through September 30, 2012, due to ☐ Department's error ☐ Respondent's error.	
3.	The Department alleges that Respondent received a OI that is still due and owing to the Department.	
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW		
Adm	artment policies are contained in the Department of Human Services Bridges inistrative Manual (BAM), Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual M), and Department of Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT).	
Resp USC Ager	The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal consibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, PL 104-193, and 42 601 to 679c. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence ncy) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10 and 400.57a and Mich Admin Code, 10.3101 to .3131.	
is es is im Depa	The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp program] stablished by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, 7 USC 2011 to 2036a and applemented by the federal regulations contained in 7 CFR 271.1 to 285.5. The artment (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FAP uant to MCL 400.10 and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001 to .3015.	
Act, Fam	The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program is established by the Social Welfare MCL 400.1119b. The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the ily Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10 Mich Admin Code, R 400.31513180.	
and Child and 104- adm	The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE XX of the Social Security Act, 42 USC 601-619, 670-679c, and 1397-1397m-5; the d Care and Development Block Grant of 1990, PL 101-508, 42 USC 9858 to 9858q; the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, PL 193. The program is implemented by 45 CFR 98.1-99.33. The Department inisters the program pursuant to MCL 400.10 and provides services to adults and Iren pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and Mich Admin Code, R 400.50015020.	

Additionally, the Claimant reported that she was disabled on her application signed October 13, 2011. Department Exhibit 5-24. The Claimant failed to provide all the required verification to determine disability. Department Exhibit 40-43. However, the code for disabled was not removed in error from Bridges. In addition, the Claimant and

her husband were attending college full time at Baker College, which if not employed at least 20 hours per week, would made them an ineligible grantee. Deaprtment Exhibit 31. Finally, the Claimant's husband's employment was miscounted at 25 hours per day paid every 2 weeks instead of 25 hours per week paid every 2 weeks. Department Exhibit 29-39. The Claimant was removed from the household group as an ineligible student. In addition, the Claimant's husband was an ineligible student for the months of October 2011, May 2012, and June 2012 and removed as a household member. Department Exhibit 44-54.

As a result, the Claimant received an overissuance of FAP benefits during the contested time period of October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012 that she was not entitled to due to Department's error. The Claimant received an overissuance of that the Department is required to recoup. BAM 105, 220, 700, 705, 725. BEM 212, 230b, 245, and 501.

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the of Law, finds that the Department ⊠ did establish a ☐ FIP ☑ FAP ☐ SDA ☐ CDC b	☐ did not	
DECISION AND ORDER		
Accordingly, the Department is		
⊠ AFFIRMED.		
∑ The Department is ORDERED to initiate accordance with Department policy.	e collection procedures for a Ol ir	

Carmen G. Fahie
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 12/10/2013

Date Mailed: 12/10/2013

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

CGF/pw

cc: