

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.:
Issue No.:
Case No.:
Hearing Date:
County:

[REDACTED]

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: C. Adam Purnell

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 [REDACTED] from Lansing, Michigan. Claimant personally appeared and provided testimony. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED] (Hearing Facilitator) and [REDACTED] (Family Independence Manager).

ISSUE

Did the Department properly determined Claimant's Food Assistance Program (FAP) monthly allotment amount?

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 was active for FAP with a monthly allotment of \$ [REDACTED]
2. Claimant was receiving RSDI in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] per month.
3. In [REDACTED], Claimant began working.
4. Effective [REDACTED], the Department began to budget Claimant's unearned income from employment at \$437.00 per month.
5. On [REDACTED], the Department mailed Claimant a Notice of Case Action (DHS-1605) which reduced Claimant's monthly FAP amount to \$ [REDACTED] for the period of [REDACTED] through [REDACTED].

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Department policies are contained in the Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), Department of Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT), and Department of Human Services Emergency Relief Manual (ERM).

The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp program] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, 7 USC 2011 to 2036a and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in 7 CFR 271.1 to 285.5. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10 and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001 to .3015.

Here, Claimant testified that she requested a hearing to dispute the reduction of her monthly FAP allotment. Specifically, Claimant stated that the reduction of her monthly FAP benefits is a major inconvenience. Claimant reported that when her monthly FAP allotment was at \$ [REDACTED] she was able to save money for plastic surgery.¹ Claimant also stated that due to the lower FAP allotment amount, she will no longer be able to travel and that she generally has less disposable income. Overall, Claimant stated that the FAP reduction has caused her great stress and she requested the Administrative Law Judge to return her monthly allotment to the amount (\$ [REDACTED] prior to the reduction.

Testimony and other evidence must be weighed 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). The weight and credibility of this evidence 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). Moreover, it is for the fact-finder to gauge the demeanor and veracity of the witnesses who appear before him, as best he is able. See, e.g., *Caldwell v Fox*, 394 Mich 401, 407; 231 NW2d 46 (1975); *Zeeland Farm Services, Inc v JBL Enterprises, Inc*, 219 Mich App 190, 195; 555 NW2d 733 (1996).

This Administrative Law Judge has carefully considered and weighed the testimony and other evidence in the record. The Department acted properly in this matter. This Administrative Law Judge had carefully reviewed the Department's budgets that were contained in evidence. In fact, Claimant has not challenged the Department's calculation of her income and expenses. Rather, Claimant simply asks for the increased monthly FAP so that she could continue to save for plastic surgery, travel expenses and life's other amenities. The Department provided a budget that showed Claimant's monthly FAP should be reduced again from [REDACTED]. The Administrative Law Judge agrees with this assessment and finds that the Department acted properly with regard to all of Claimant's monthly FAP reductions in this regard.

¹ Claimant testified that she was planning to have a "nose job" which reportedly costs approximately \$5,000.00.

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 acted in accordance with Department policy when it reduced Claimant's monthly FAP amount.

DECISION AND ORDER

Accordingly, the Department's decision is **AFFIRMED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



C. Adam Purnell
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: May 19, 2014

Date Mailed: May 20, 2014

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.

2014-34619/CAP

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

CAP/las

cc:

