

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**



Reg. No.: 201329278  
Issue No.: 1038  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: March 19, 2013  
County: Saginaw

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Susanne E. Harris

**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 March 19, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Andre Lindsey Sr. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED], DHS Triage Specialist, [REDACTED] DHS-PATH Coordinator, [REDACTED], PATH Triage Specialist.

**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 March 1, 2013, the Department  denied Claimant's application  closed Claimant's case due to his failure to attend an employment related appointment.

3. On February 1, 2012, the Department sent  
 Claimant       Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)  
notice of the       denial.     closure.
4. On February 12, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the  
 denial of the application.     closure of the case.

### **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, R 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, R 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 AACS, R 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, R 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.

In this case, the Claimant was sent a DHS-2444, Notice of Non-compliance informing him that he was in non-compliance because he missed an appointment on February 1, 2013. The Claimant stated that he was late to the appointment because he had [REDACTED] issues and his [REDACTED] was late. When asked why it was that he did not accept the [REDACTED] which was offered to him, he reiterated that he could not walk to the [REDACTED], as he weighs in excess of 265 pounds. Toward the end of the hearing, the Claimant contradicted himself and stated that the issue was not that he could not physically get there, but rather he did not understand why he is not in compliance in the first instance because of his community service. The Claimant's testimony is inconsistent and the Department's Exhibits are very persuasive and the Administrative Law Judge therefore concludes that the Claimant simply did not attend the appointment he was required to on February 1, 2013.

Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 233A (2013) p. 4 provides that transportation issues can constitute good cause if the Claimant requested transportation services from DHS, PATH, or other employment services provider prior to case closure and reasonably priced [REDACTED] is not available to the Claimant. In this case, [REDACTED] services were actually offered to the Claimant and he declined them. Furthermore, the Claimant did also testify that it was not an issue of his being able to [REDACTED] get to the appointment as much as it was that he simply disagreed that his community service was insufficient activity to constitute compliance. As such, I find that when the Department determined that the Claimant was in non-compliance with employment related activities without good cause and then took action to close the Claimant's FIP case, the Department was acting in accordance with its policy.

Based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> properly denied Claimant's application     | <input type="checkbox"/> improperly denied Claimant's application |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> properly closed Claimant's case | <input type="checkbox"/> 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.

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

/s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
Susanne E. Harris  
Administrative Law Judge  
For Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 3/22/13

Date Mailed: 3/22/13

**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

SEH/tb

cc:

