

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 201351750
Issue No.: 1038; 3029
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: July 11, 2013
County: St. Clair

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 July 11, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED] and her [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included PATH Co-ordinator, [REDACTED] and PATH Liason, [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 July 1, 2013, the Department
 denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's FIP case
due to non-compliance with employment related activities.
3. On July 1, 2013, the Department
 denied Claimant's application sanctioned Claimant's FAP case
due to non-compliance with employment related activities.
4. There is no date on the DHS-1605, Notice of Case Action in evidence. Per the
Department's hearing summary, on May 22, 2013, the Department sent
 Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)
notice of the denial. FIP closure and FAP sanction.
5. On May 30, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the
 denial of the application. FIP closure and FAP sanction.

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 AAC, 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's alleged non-compliance is a failure to submit job search logs for the Weeks of April 29, 2013 and May 6, 2013. There is conflicting evidence in the record as to whether or not the Claimant's contact at [REDACTED] faxed these job search logs to the Claimant's caseworker at Work First (WF). The Claimant signed a customer responsibility form on February 14, 2013 acknowledging that no log sheets would be accepted by fax, yet the Claimant testified that it was the contact at [REDACTED] who faxed them in. Furthermore, the Claimant's [REDACTED] testified that the Claimant is easily confused and was not sure for which weeks it was alleged that she was missing job search logs. The Claimant testified that though she does not like to "use it as a crutch," she does have [REDACTED]. Indeed, it is documented in the case notes that the Claimant once told her WF worker, when asked why she did not keep the original job search logs, "I'm not the brightest person, you know." The Claimant's contact at [REDACTED] and the case worker at WF were not present at the hearing to testify. The Department workers present did testify that all of the Claimant's barriers would have been addressed at WF during her orientation, though the Department workers would have no personal knowledge of that.

Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 233A (2013), pp. 8, 9, provide that the DHS-2444 Notice of Non-compliance state the date/dates of the Claimant's non-compliance and the reason why the Claimant was determined to be non-compliant. In this case, the DHS-2444, Notice of non-compliance, sent May 22, 2013, gives the Claimant notice that she was noncompliant on May 14, 2013 because of "no participation in required activity." The Administrative Law Judge determines that the date of non-compliance on the DHS-2444, Notice of Non-compliance is inconsistent with the alleged non-compliance in the WF notes. Furthermore, the testimony of the Claimant's [REDACTED] is that the Claimant is easily confused, particularly about which job search logs the Department alleged it was missing. Lastly, the Administrative Law Judge finds that the evidence is far from sufficient to establish that all of the Claimant's barriers to self-sufficiency were address at orientation. Therefore, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that when the Department took action to close the Claimant's FIP case, the Department was not 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 type="checkbox"/> properly closed Claimant's case | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> improperly closed Claimant's case |

for: AMP FIP FAP MA SDA CDC.

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

properly denied Claimant's application improperly denied Claimant's application
 properly closed Claimant's case improperly sanctioned 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 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**.

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 FIP case and remove the Claimant's FAP sanction back to the closure date, and
2. Initiate action to issue the Claimant any supplements she may thereafter be due.

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

Date Signed: 7/15/13

Date Mailed: 7/16/13

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:

