

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2013-33596  
Issue No.: 1005  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: August 14, 2013  
County: Kent County DHS

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Corey A. Arendt

**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 August 14, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED].

**ISSUE**

Did the Department properly close the Claimant's Family Independence Program (FIP) case?

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

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

1. As of December 11, 2012, the Claimant received FIP benefits.
2. On December 11, 2012, the Department sent the Claimant a redetermination packet. The packet was due by January 2, 2013.
3. On or around December 11, 2012, the Claimant received the redetermination packet.
4. As of January 19, 2013, the Claimant had not returned the redetermination packet.
5. On January 19, 2013, the Department sent the Claimant a notice of case action. The notice indicated the Claimant's FIP case was closing for failure to return the redetermination packet. The closure was to take effect February 1, 2013.
6. On February 7, 2013, the Claimant returned the Redetermination packet.
7. On February 12, 2013, the Claimant reapplied for FIP benefits.

8. On February 27, 2013, the Claimant requested a hearing to protest the January 19, 2013 notice of case action.

### **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 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 Department of Human Services must periodically re-determine an individual's eligibility. The redetermination process includes thorough review of all eligibility factors.

Clients must cooperate with the local office in determining initial and ongoing eligibility. This includes completion of necessary forms. Clients must completely and truthfully answer all questions on forms and in interviews.

A redetermination/review packet is considered complete when all of the sections of the redetermination form including the signature section are completed. If the redetermination packet is not logged in by the negative action cutoff date of the redetermination month, Bridges generates a DHS-1605, Notice of Case Action, and automatically closes the EDG. (BAM 210).

Testimony and other evidence must be weighed and considered according to its reasonableness.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, the weight and credibility of this evidence is generally for the fact-finder to determine.<sup>2</sup> In evaluating the credibility and weight to be given to the testimony of a witness, the fact-finder may consider the demeanor of the witness, the reasonableness of the witness's testimony, and the interest, if any, the witness may have in the outcome of the matter.<sup>3</sup>

After reviewing the evidence, I find the Department witnesses to be slightly more credible than the Claimant as they had a clearer recollection of the dates, times and events in question. Therefore, I find the Claimant more likely than not received the redetermination packet timely and thereafter failed to adhere to the redetermination requirements by failing to timely file the appropriate documents by January 2, 2013. This in and of itself is sufficient for the Department to close the case.

Accordingly, I find evidence to affirm the Department in this matter.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Gardiner v Courtright*, 165 Mich 54, 62; 130 NW 322 (1911); *Dep't of Community Health v Risch*, 274 Mich App 365, 372; 733 NW2d 403 (2007).

<sup>2</sup> *Dep't of Community Health*, 274 Mich App at 372; *People v Terry*, 224 Mich App 447, 452; 569 NW2d 641 (1997).

<sup>3</sup> *People v Wade*, 303 Mich 303 (1942), *cert den*, 318 US 783 (1943).

**DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, finds that the Department did act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's decision is **AFFIRMED**.



---

**Corey A. Arendt**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: August 15, 2013

Date Mailed: August 15, 2013

**NOTICE OF APPEAL:** 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 or Reconsideration was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the Decision and Order of Reconsideration or Rehearing Decision.

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

CAA/las

cc:

