

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 201337082
Issue No.: 1038
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: April 25, 2013
County: Genesee- 02

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 25, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included Triage Coordinator, [REDACTED] and PATH Coordinators [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].

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)? |

Did the Department properly deny Claimant's application sanction 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 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).

2. On April 1, 2013, the Department denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's FIP case due to his non-compliance with employment related activities.

3. On April 1, 2013, the Department denied Claimant's application sanctioned Claimant's FAP case due to his non-compliance with employment related activities.

4. On February 19, 2013, the Department sent Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the denial. FIP closure.

5. On February 19, 2013, the Department sent Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the denial. FAP sanction.

6. On March 12, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the denial of the application. closure of the FIP case and sanction of his FAP 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 AACRS, 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 the present case, Claimant requested a hearing to dispute the Department's action. Soon after commencement of the hearing, the parties testified that they had reached a settlement concerning the disputed action on the Claimant's FAP case. Consequently, the Department agreed to do the following: Reinstate the Claimant's FAP benefits back to April 1, 2013 when they were reduced, and issue the Claimant a supplement for the month of April of 2013..

As a result of this settlement, Claimant no longer wishes to proceed with the FAP portion of the hearing. As such, it is unnecessary for this Administrative Law Judge to render a decision regarding the facts and issues of the FAP portion of this case.

The Claimant testified that his [REDACTED] was sick around the time he stopped participating in employment related activities. The Claimant stated that he did not receive the non-compliance warning letter or the triage letter in time to make those meetings. The DHS-2444, Notice of Non-compliance was mailed to the Claimant eight days before his scheduled triage meeting. It is not contested that the Claimant did not attend triage. The Claimant confirmed that his address remained the same at all times relevant to the hearing. 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's testimony at hearing is insufficient to rebut the presumption that he timely received the DHS-2444, Notice of Non-compliance. Based on the Claimant's own testimony at hearing, he does not have verification of his [REDACTED] [REDACTED] even now at the time of hearing. Therefore, when

the Department determined, in his absence, that the Claimant had no good cause for his non-compliance, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department was acting in accordance with its policy. Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 233A (2013) p. 6, provides that the penalty for noncompliance without good cause is FIP case closure. The Administrative Law Judge therefore concludes that when the Department 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, 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.

SETTLEMENT ORDER

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 reinstate the Claimant's full FAP benefits back to April 1, 2013, and
2. Initiate action to issue the Claimant a supplement for the month of April of 2013.

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

Date Signed: 4/30/13

Date Mailed: 4/30/13

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/nr

cc:

