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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No:201262175Issue No:1006Case No:Hearing Date:Hearing Date:February 20, 2014Kent County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Suzanne D. Sonneborn

HEARING DECISION

Upon a hearing request by the Department of Human Se rvices (Department) to establish an overissuance (OI) of benefits to Res pondent, this matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9, 400.43a, and 24.201, *et seq.*, and Mich Admin Code, R 400.941, and in acc ordance with 7 CFR 273.15 to 273.18, 42 CFR 431.200 to 431.250, 45 CFR 99.1 to 99.33, and 45 CFR 205.10. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on February 20, 2014 from Lansing, Michigan. Respondent appeared by three-department was represented by the department's Kent County office

ISSUE

Whether Respondent received an over issuance (OI) of Family Independence Program (FIP) benefits that the department is entitled to recoup?

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

- 1. Respondent was a recipient of FIP benefits at all times relevant to this matter.
- On May 18, 2012, the department maile d Respondent a written notice (DHS-4358-A) that she received an over issuan ce of FIP benefits in the amount of \$964.00 during the period February 1, 2012 through March 32, 2012 as a result of client error.¹ (Department Exhibits A, G)

¹ The Department subsequently determined that the over issuance was the result of agency error. (Department Exhibit G)

3. On June 6, 2012, Respondent submitted a hearing request, protesting the department's determination that she must repay the FIP over-issuance.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Clients have the right to c ontest a department decis ion affe cting eligibil ity or benefit levels whenever it is believed that the decision is incorrect. The department will provide an administrative hearing to rev iew the decision and determine the appropriateness of that decision. Department of Human Serv ices Bridges Adminis trative Manual (BAM) 600 (2011), p. 1. The regulations gov erning the h earing and appeal pr occess for applicants and recipients of public assistance in Michigan are found in sections 400.901 to 400.951 of the Michigan Administrative C ode (Mich Admin Code). An opportunity for a hearing shall be granted to an applicant who requests a hearing because his claim for assistance is denied. Mich Admin Code R 400.903(1).

The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and W ork Opportunity Reconc iliation Act of 1996, PL 104-193, and 42 USC 601 to 679c. The Depart tment (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MC L 400.10 and 400.57a and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3101 to .3131.

All earned and unear ned income available to t he client is countable. Earned income means income received from another person or organization or from self-employment for duties that were performed for compensa tion or profit. Unearned incom e means all income that is not earned, including but not limited to funds received from the Family Independence Program (FIP), S tate Disability Assistance (SDA), Child Dev elopment and Care (CDC), Medicaid (MA), Social Se curity Benefits (RSDI/SSI), Veterans Administration (VA), Unemploy ment Com pensation Benefits (UCB), Adult Medical Program (AMA), alimony, and c hild s upport payments. The amount counted may be more than the client actually receives bec ause the gross amount is used prior to any deductions. BEM 500.

The Department determines a client's el igibility for program benefits based on the client's act ual income and/or prospective in come. Actual income is income that w as already received. Prospective income is income not yet received but exp ected. Prospective budgeting is the best estimate of the client's future income. BEM 505.

All income is converted to a standard monthly amount. If the client is paid weekly, the Department multiplies the average weekly amount by 4.3. If the client is paid ever y other week, the Department multiplies the average bi-weekly amount by 2.15. BEM 505.

An over issuance is the amount of benefits issued to the cli ent group in excess of what they were eligible to receive. BAM 705. The amount of the over issuance is the amount of benefits the group actually received minus the amount the group was eligible t o

receive. BAM 720. When a client group receives more benefits than they are entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the over issuance. BAM 700.

Department errors are caused by incorrect actions by the Department. BAM 705. Department error over issuances are not pursued if the estimated over issuance is less than **\$** per program. BAM 7 05. The agency error threshold was rais ed to **\$** from **\$** with an effective date of December 1, 2012. BAM 7 05. Client errors occur when the customer gave incorrect or incomplete information to the Department. Clien t errors are not establis hed if the over issuance is less than **\$** unless the client group is active for the over issuance program, or the over issuance is a result of a quality control audit finding. BAM 700.

In this case, Respondent was a recipient of FIP benef its and, due to an agency error, she received an over issuance of such benef its in the amount of during the period February 1, 2012 through March 32, 2012.

At the February 20, 2014 he aring, the Department's representative, Amy Wright, provided testimony and documentary evidence establishing that, despite Res pondent's timely and accurate report of the employment of her FIP group member, the Department failed to pr operly budget this employment in come in a timely manner, resulting in an over issuance of FIP benefits to Respondent.

In response to the D epartment's presentation, Respondent testified that she felt the Department's over issuance determination was unfair and that she should not be punished for an error caused b y the Dep artment in failin g to accurately budget her household member's employment earnings.

Testimony and other evidence must be we ighed and considered according to its reasonableness. *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). Moreover, the weight and credi bility of this evidenc e is generally for the fact-finder to determine. *Dep't of Community Health*, 274 Mich App at 372; *People v Terry*, 224 Mich App 447, 452; 569 NW2d 641 (1997).

This Administrative Law Judge has carefully considered and weighed the testimony and other evidence in t he record and must note that, not withstanding Respondent's testimony regarding principles of fairness, administrative adj udication is an exercise of executive power rather than judicial power, and restricts the granting of equitable remedies. *Michiga n Mutual Lia bility Co. v Baker*, 295 Mich 237; 294 NW 168 (1940). Accordingly, based on the competent, mate rial, and substantial evidence presented during the February 20, 2014 hearing, the department properly determined that Claimant received an over issuance of FIP benefits in the amount of \$964.00 during the period February 1, 2012 through March 32, 2012, which the department is required to recoup.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon t he above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the department properly determined that Claimant received an over issuance of FIP benef its in the amount of **Sectors** during the period Februar y 1, 2012 through March 32, 2012, which the department is required to recoup. Accordingly, the department's recoupment of Claim ant's over issuance of FI P benefits in the amount of **Sectors** is **UPHELD** and the Department is ORDERED to in itiate collection procedures in this amount in accordance with Department policy.

It is **SO ORDERED**.

Suzanne D. Sonneborn Administrative Law Judge for Maura D. Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: February 21, 2014

Date Mailed: February 21, 2014

NOTICE OF APPEAL: The claimant may appeal the Decision and Order to Circuit Court within 30 days of the receipt of the Deci sion and Order or, if a ti mely Request for Rehearing or Reconsideration was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the Decision and Order of Rec onsideration or Rehearing Decision.

Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS) may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the req uest of a p arty within 30 days of the mailing date of this De cision and Order. MAHS will not order a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's motion where the final deci sion cannot be implemented within 90 days of the filing of the original request (60 days for FAP cases).

A Request for Rehearing or Reconsideration may be granted when one of the following exists:

- Newly discovered evidence that existe d 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 a ddress in the hearing d ecision 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

SDS/hj

