

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2013 19205  
Issue No.: 1038  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: February 13, 2013  
County: Oakland (02)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Lynn M. Ferris

**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 13, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department ) included [REDACTED] Path Coordinator, and [REDACTED] Case Manager.

**ISSUE**

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

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)?    |
| <input 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 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).  |

2. On January 1, 2013, the Department  
 denied Claimant's application     closed Claimant's case  
due to failure to participate in work-related activities without good cause.
3. On November 30, , 2012 , the Department sent  
 Claimant     Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)  
notice of the     denial.     closure.
4. All notices sent to the Claimant were sent to the correct address. Exhibits 5, 6 and 9.
5. The Claim ant was sent and received a no tice to attend Work First Orientation on  
November 20, 2012 and di d not attend the orientation. On August 8, 2012 the  
Claimant was found to be work ready by the MRT with restrictions after a previous  
medical deferral ended. Exhibit 1.
6. The Claim ant did not attend the triage scheduled for December 7, 2012. A triage  
was held and the Department found no good cause for Claim ant's failure to attend  
the Work First Orientation. Exhibits 8 and 6.
7. The Notice of Non-Compliance providing th e claimant notice of the triage was sent  
to the Claimant's correct address.
8. The Claim ant provided medical information to the Department on or about  
December 12, 2012 after the triage.
9. On December 21, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the  
 denial of the application.     closure of the FIP case.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

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

The Family Independence Program (FIP) wa s established pursuant to the Personal  
Responsibility and W ork Opportunity Reconc iliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193,  
42 USC 601, *et seq.* The Department (formerly k nown 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 Assistanc e Program (FAP) [fo rmerly known as the Food Sta mp (FS)  
program] is establis hed by the Food St amp Act of 1977, as amended, and is  
implemented by the federal r egulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal  
Regulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independenc e  
Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 1999 AC, Rule  
400.3001 through Rule 400.3015.

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, 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, *et seq.*

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 2000 AACCS, Rule 400.3151 through Rule 400.3180.

The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE and XX of the Social Security Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 1990, and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. The program is implemented by Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 98 and 99. The Department provides services to adults and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and 1999 AC, Rule 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.

Additionally, in this case the Claimant testified that she did not receive the Notice of Non Compliance scheduling a triage. Exhibit 6. The notice was sent to the Claimant at her proper address. The Claimant received the Notice of Appointment and the Notice of Case Action, both of which were sent to the Claimant's correct address. The Notice of Non Compliance was sent to the Claimant at the correct address. The Notice of Case Action dated November 30, 2012 was sent to the Claimant at the correct address and was received by the Claimant causing the claimant to request a hearing. The Claimant also received other notices sent to her by the Department including a Notice of Appointment dated November 7, 2012 assigning her to attend the Work First Program Orientation on November 20, 2012.

It is well established law that the proper mailing and addressing of a letter creates a presumption of receipt. That presumption may be rebutted by evidence. *Stacey v Sankovich*, 19 Mich App 638 (1969); *Good v Detroit Automobile Inter-Insurance Exchange*, 67 Mich App 270 (1976). The Claimant did not articulate any ongoing problems with her mail. It is also apparent that the Claimant in fact received all the other mail sent to her by the Department including the Notice of Case Action. Based upon the evidence presented and the testimony of the parties, it is found that the Claimant did not present any evidence that rebutted the presumption that the letter and Notice of Non Compliance were received. Thus it is specifically found that the Claimant did receive the notices and did not respond. Based upon this finding and considering the testimony of the Department that a proper triage was conducted and no good cause for failure to attend the Work First Orientation was found, it is determined that the

Department's closure of the Claimant's FIP case and imposition of a 3 month sanction was correct as the Claimant did not attend the Work First Orientation as scheduled and did not provide the Department at orientation new medical evidence that she should be deferred. The documentation provided to the Department was after the triage was held and does not change the Department's actions at the triage as the doctor's letter provided does not allege any new medical condition. The Claimant may reapply for FIP benefits at any time after expiration of the 3 month sanction imposed.

The Claimant is cautioned that continuing sanction for non-participation in work-related activities could ultimately result in a lifetime disqualification from receiving FIP cash assistance. An individual must report to orientation unless deferred from attending. This comment and decision do not address any medical deferral issues but the information is provided so that the Claimant is aware of the significance of receiving any further sanction for non-participation and attendance regarding the Work First Program.

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

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.



**Lynn M. Ferris**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: February 21, 2013

Date Mailed: February 21, 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 receipt of the Decision and Order or, if a timely request for rehearing was made, within 30 days of the receipt 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

LMF/cl

cc:

