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

IN THE MATTER OF:		
	Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	14-003859 1001 August 14, 2014 MACOMB #36
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Susanne E. Harris		
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 August 14, 2014, from Lansing, Michigan Participants on behalf of Claimant included Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Hearing Facilitator, from the Sterling Heights DHS office and		
<u>ISSUE</u>		
Did the Department properly 🔀 deny Claimant's application for:		
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)?☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)?☐ Medical Assistance (MA)?☐ Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)?	State Disability Ass Child Developmer Direct Support Ser State SSI Paymen	nt and Care (CDC)? vices (DSS)?
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 ☑ FIP benefits.		

On May 22, 2014, the Department M denied Claimant's application due to her

3. On May 22, 2014, the Department sent Claimant its decision.

daughter having her own FIP case.

2.

4. On June 2, 2014, Claimant filed a hearing request protesting the Department's actions.

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), and Department of Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

☐ The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, PL 104-193, and 42 USC 601 to 679c. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10 and 400.57a and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3101 to .3131.

There was no one present at the hearing with any personal knowledge of the events in the Claimant's case. The Department's workers asserted that the Claimant's application was denied because her daughter was active on her own case. The Claimant testified that she was informed that she was denied due to an issue of her household composition. Later, her case was opened for just one month and then was subsequently closed.

Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 210 (2013) p. 1, provides that group composition is the determination of which individuals living together are included in the FIP eligibility determination. BEM 210 p. 5, provides that a child's child is a mandatory member of a FIP group. In this case, the Department's representatives at the hearing could not testify with any personal knowledge or certainty of the events of the Claimant's case. There was also no DHS-1605, Notice of Case Action in evidence. As such, this Administrative Law Judge determines that the evidence is insufficient to establish that the Department was acting in accordance with Departmental policy when taking action to deny the Claimant's application for FIP benefits.

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, if any, finds that the Department \boxtimes failed to satisfy its burden of showing that it acted in accordance with Department policy when it took action to deny the Claimant's application for FIP benefits.

DECISION AND ORDER

Accordingly, the Department's decision is \boxtimes REVERSED.

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:

- 1. Re-determine the Claimant's eligibility for FIP benefits, and
- 2. Issue the Claimant any supplement that she may thereafter be due.

Susanne E. Harris Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Susanne E Harris

Date Signed: 8/25/2014

Date Mailed: 8/25/2014

NOTICE OF APPEAL: A party may appeal this Hearing Decision in the circuit court in the county in which he/she resides, or the circuit court in Ingham County, within 30 days of the receipt date.

A party may request a rehearing or reconsideration of this Hearing Decision from the Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS) within 30 days of the mailing date of this Hearing Decision, or MAHS may order a rehearing or reconsideration on its own motion.

MAHS may grant a party's Request for Rehearing or Reconsideration 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 Claimant;
- Failure of the ALJ to address in the hearing decision relevant issues raised in the hearing request.

The party requesting a rehearing or reconsideration 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 this Hearing Decision is mailed.

A written request may be faxed or mailed to MAHS. If submitted by fax, 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

SEH/tb

