

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2013-40844
Issue No.: 1038
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: May 9, 2013
County: Wayne (49)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Jan Leventer

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 May 9, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED], Family Independence Manager and [REDACTED], Partnership. Accountability. Training. Hope (PATH) Worker.

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 May 1, 2013, the Department
 denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's case
due to a determination that she failed to participate in work-readiness requirements.
3. On March 28, 2013, the Department sent
 Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)
notice of the denial. closure.
4. On April 9, 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, Rule 400.3101 through Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996.

Additionally, the Department's Jobs, Education and Training (JET) program, is regulated by the Department's Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 233A, "Failure to Meet Employment and/or Self-Sufficiency-Related Requirements: FIP." BEM 233A requires customers receiving FIP cash assistance benefits to participate in work-readiness, job search, education and employment programs. Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 233A (2013).

Work-readiness records in evidence in this case indicate that for four weeks, from June 25, 2012-July 20, 2012, Claimant completed zero (0) hours of work-related activity. Dept. Exh. 1, p. 5. Although Claimant at the hearing testified that she was working at Dollar Store at the time, she presented no records to prove that she was employed, and she presented no income records necessary to adjust her FIP benefits to the appropriate level. Also, she did not present information regarding the number of hours worked per week, and this information was necessary for the Department to determine whether she met the time commitments of the JET program.

At the hearing Claimant testified that she did inform the Department that she worked at the Dollar Store, but there is nothing in the file to show that she did so in a timely fashion. Her FIP benefits were never adjusted, as they would have been if she was working and reported her income as required. Claimant testified she did not keep copies of any documents she submitted to the Department and could not support her testimony with proper documentation.

In this case the Claimant did not attend the triage, but she did attend the pre-hearing conference. Because Claimant does not have the documentation needed to support her employment at Dollar Store or elsewhere, it would be futile to reverse this case and require the Department to hold a triage.

Holding a triage in this case would be pointless because the Claimant admitted she does not have documentation to support her testimony. The administrative hearing process is established to address customer grievances and it is not for the purpose of requiring a triage where the outcome is known in advance. As Claimant testified she has no documentation at the hearing, there is no reason to suppose she would have such documentation at a later date either.

Accordingly, the Department's action in terminating Claimant's FIP benefits is found and determined to be correct and shall be affirmed.

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.



Jan Leventer
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: May 13, 2013

Date Mailed: May 13, 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 affect the substantial rights of the claimant:
 - 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

JL/tm

cc:

