

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2013-16180; 2013-16977  
Issue No.: 1003; 3008  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: February 4, 2013  
County: WAYNE (57)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Susan C. Burke

**HEARING DECISION**

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 following Claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on February 4, 2013, in Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], Lead Child Support Specialist for the Office of Child Support.

Two hearing requests (Registration Numbers 2013-16180 and 2013-16977) were heard at the same time, as the same issue was raised in each request.

**ISSUE**

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

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)?    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP)?     | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA)? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA)?                      | <input type="checkbox"/> 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. Claimant  applied for benefits  received benefits for:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP). | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP).    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP).     | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA). |

2. On November 6, 2012. the Office of Child Support placed a noncooperation sanction on Claimant's case
3. On December 1, 2012, the Department  
 denied Claimant's application     closed Claimant's case     decreased Claimant's benefits due to failure to cooperate in establishing paternity. (Exhibit 1)
4. In 2009, the Office of Child Support found Claimant to be cooperative with regard to establishing paternity for the same child at issue.
5. Claimant cooperated with the Office of Child Support with respect to the November 6, 2012 sanction.
6. On November 19, 2012 and December 4, 2012, Claimant filed hearing requests, protesting the  
 denial of the application.     closure of the case.     decrease.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

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

The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 42 USC 601, *et seq.* The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 1999 AC, Rule 400.3101 through Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996.

The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly 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, Rule 400.3001 through Rule 400.3015.

In the present case, the Department closed Claimant's FIP case and decreased Claimant's FAP benefits due to failure to cooperate with regard to child support issues. However, the Office of Child Support acknowledges that it had questioned Claimant in 2009 with regard to the child at issue and found Claimant to be cooperative. In addition, Claimant testified credibly that she cooperated with the Office of Child Support when they contacted her again in 2012.

I find that Claimant did cooperate with the Office of Child Support, based on the above discussion.

Based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, 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 Claimant's case  
 properly calculated Claimant's benefits     improperly decreased Claimant's benefits

for:  AMP  FIP  FAP  MA  SDA  CDC.

**DECISION AND ORDER**


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

did act properly.     did not act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's  AMP  FIP  FAP  MA  SDA  CDC decision is  AFFIRMED  REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.

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

1. Initiate removal of the child support sanction from Claimant's case, engaging the Office of Child Support, if necessary.
2. Initiate reinstatement and restoration of Claimant's FIP and FAP benefits, effective December 1, 2012, if Claimant is otherwise eligible for the programs.
3. Issue FIP and FAP supplements for any missed or increased payments, in accordance with Department policy.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Susan C. Burke**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: February 7, 2013

Date Mailed: February 7, 2013

**NOTICE:** 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)

The Claimant may appeal the Decision and Order to Circuit Court within 30 days of the mailing date of the Decision and Order or, if a timely request for rehearing was made, within 30 days of the mailing date of the rehearing decision.

Claimant may request a rehearing or reconsideration for the following reasons:

- A rehearing **MAY** be granted if there is newly discovered evidence that could affect the outcome of the original hearing decision.
- A reconsideration **MAY** be granted for any of the following reasons:
  - misapplication of manual policy or law in the hearing decision,
  - typographical errors, mathematical error, or other obvious errors in the hearing decision that effect the substantial rights of the claimant:
  - the failure of the ALJ to address other relevant issues in the hearing decision.

Request must be submitted through the local DHS office or directly to MAHS by mail at  
Michigan Administrative Hearings  
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request  
P. O. Box 30639  
Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

SCB/tm

cc:

