

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 201335355
Issue No.: 3019
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: April 17, 2013
County: Macomb 20

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 April 17, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED] and his [REDACTED]. The Claimant clarified that his [REDACTED] was a witness and not his Authorized Hearing Representative. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included Eligibility Specialist (ES) [REDACTED].

ISSUE

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

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input 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 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). |

2. On April 1, 2013, the Department denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's case due to a criminal justice disqualification.

3. On March 11, 2013, the Department sent
 Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)
notice of the denial. closure.
4. On March 15, 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.

The Department relied on the Claimant's report that he had two [REDACTED] [REDACTED] approximately eight years ago. At hearing, the Claimant indicated that he did not know if they were [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] but that he was [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] a [REDACTED] amount of [REDACTED] and he went to [REDACTED] and it was dismissed. The ES report of the OIG's statement in the record indicates that the OIG could not find any [REDACTED] on the Lexis/Nexus and the ES testified that nothing was found on the Offender Information Tracking System (OTIS). The Claimant's [REDACTED] [REDACTED] was never verified and essentially, the ES relied on the Claimant's word that he had [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. At hearing, the Claimant testified that he was unsure that they were [REDACTED] and that the charges stemmed from the same incident. The Department could not refute this testimony.

Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 203 (2012) p. 2 provides that a Claimant convicted of felony use, possession or distribution of controlled substances two or more times in separate periods will be permanently disqualified if both offenses occurred after August 22, 1996. In this case, the Department relied on the Claimant's word that he had [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] and the Claimant testified under oath that he is unsure that they were [REDACTED] [REDACTED] that the [REDACTED] stemmed from the same incident and, inconsistently, the Claimant testified that he went to [REDACTED] and the charges were dismissed. After inquiring of the OIG and searching the OTIS, the Department has no other evidence of the Claimant having any drug related [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. Therefore, the evidence is insufficient to establish that the Claimant has [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] two or more times in separate periods since August of 1996. As such, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department did not act in accordance with its policy when taking action to close the Claimant's FAP case.

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.

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

1. Initiate action to re-determine the Claimant's eligibility for FAP back to the closure date, and

2. Initiate action to issue the Claimant any supplements he may thereafter be due.

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

Date Signed: 4/17/13

Date Mailed: 4/19/13

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:

