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

#### IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 201417910 Issue No(s).: 3001; 3005

Case No.:

Hearing Date: January 15, 2014

County: Wayne (15)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Robert J. Chavez

## **HEARING DECISION**

Following Claimant's request for a hearing, this matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and 400.37; 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 January 15, 2014, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included . Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included , APW and FIM.

# ISSUE

Did the Department properly deny claimant's FAP application for a third lifetime IPV sanction?

# FINDINGS OF FACT

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

- Claimant applied for FAP benefits on
- 2. Department records showed that claimant was currently under sanction for a third Intentional Program Violation (IPV).
- 3. Department records only showed a sanction levied on other IPV's, though that sanction was listed as a third IPV.
- 4. Claimant admitted to one IPV, but stated that she had no other IPV sanctions or cases.

5.	The record was extended for 30 days on to allow the Department time to search previous files for evidence of claimant's other IPVs.	
6.	On the Department admitted that there were no IPVs in claimant's prior case files, and that the lifetime sanction was most likely in error.	
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW		
Adn (BE	partment policies are contained in the Department of Human Services Bridges prinistrative Manual (BAM), Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual M), Department of Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT), and partment of Human Services Emergency Relief Manual (ERM).	
Res US( Age	The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal ponsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, PL 104-193, and 42 C 601 to 679c. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence ancy) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10 and 400.57a and Mich Admin Code, 00.3101 to .3131.	
is e is ir Dep	The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp program] stablished by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, 7 USC 2011 to 2036a and implemented by the federal regulations contained in 7 CFR 271.1 to 285.5. The partment (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FAP suant to MCL 400.10 and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001 to .3015.	
Sec 100 Inde	The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social urity Act, 42 USC 1396-1396w-5, and is implemented by 42 CFR 400.200 to 8.59. The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family ependence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10 and MCL .105.	
	The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315 and is ninistered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10.	
Act, Fan	The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program is established by the Social Welfare MCL 400.1119b. The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the nily Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10 Mich Admin Code, R 400.31513180.	
and Chil and	The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE XX of the Social Security Act, 42 USC 601-619, 670-679c, and 1397-1397m-5; the d Care and Development Block Grant of 1990, PL 101-508, 42 USC 9858 to 9858q; the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, PL -193. The program is implemented by 45 CFR 98.1-99.33. The Department	

children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and Mich Admin Code, R 400.50015020.
☐ The State Emergency Relief (SER) program is established by the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1119b. The SER program is administered by the Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) pursuant to MCL 400.10 and by Mich Admin Code, R 400.7001 through R 400.7049.
☐ Direct Support Services (DSS) is established by the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1119b. The program is administered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10 and 400.57a and Mich Admin Code R 400.3603.
☐ The State SSI Payments (SSP) program is established by 20 CFR 416.20012099 and the Social Security Act, 42 USC 1382e. The Department administers the program pursuant to MCL 400.10.

The sanction for three Intentional Program Violations (IPV) is a lifetime ban from assistance, with regard to the FAP program. BAM 720, pg. 16.

However, the Department must first establish that a particular client has three IPVs.

In the current case, the Department has failed to meet that burden.

Claimant admitted on the record to one established IPV, and stated that she had been sanctioned and served a penalty in 1994. This is consistent with Bridges records showing that claimant had an IPV sanction that began on October 1, 1994.

However, claimant disputed that she had received two other IPV sanctions. Claimant's Bridges record only showed the one sanction, though that sanction was listed as a third sanction.

In order to get to the truth of the matter, the Department was ordered to examine claimant's prior case file. In a report made back to the Administrative Law Judge, Department Exhibit 4, the Department conceded that they were unable to find any record of previous IPV sanctions, and concluded that it was unlikely that claimant had three IPVs and a resultant lifetime FAP ban.

As such, given that there is only evidence of one sanction, and given that the Department has conceded that there are no other recorded sanctions, the undersigned must conclude that the current notation in claimant's Bridges file that she has three IPV sanctions is erroneous. Given that, the undersigned must hold that claimant's October 18, 2013 FAP application denial was in error.

The Department must correct their file and reprocess the application in question.

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, if any, finds that the Department	
<ul> <li>□ acted in accordance with Department policy when it .</li> <li>□ did not act in accordance with Department policy when it .</li> <li>☑ failed to satisfy its burden of showing that it acted in accordance with Department policy when it denied claimant's FAP application.</li> </ul>	
DECISION AND ORDER	
Accordingly, the Department's decision is	
<ul> <li>□ AFFIRMED.</li> <li>□ REVERSED.</li> <li>□ AFFIRMED IN PART with respect to and REVERSED IN PART with respect to .</li> </ul>	
☐ THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO BEGIN DOING THE FOLLOWING, IN ACCORDANCE WITH DEPARTMENT POLICY AND CONSISTENT WITH THIS HEARING DECISION, WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER:	
<ol> <li>Change claimant's case record to note that claimant has only one IPV penalty, and note that this penalty has been served as of October 1, 1995.</li> </ol>	
2. Reprocess claimant's October 18, 2013 FAP application.	
Robert J. Chavez  Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services  Date Signed: 2/27/2014	
- 410 0.g. 104. <u>- 121/2011</u>	

Date Mailed: <u>2/27/2014</u>

**NOTICE OF APPEAL:** 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 or Reconsideration was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the Decision and Order of Reconsideration or Rehearing Decision.

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).

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

- Newly discovered evidence that existed 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 address in the hearing decision 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

## RJC/hw

