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:	14-005172 6001 July 28, 2014 WAYNE-55	
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 July 28, 2014, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included ES.			
<u>ISSUE</u>			
Did the Department properly \square deny Claimant's application \boxtimes close Claimant's case for:			
 ☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)? ☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)? ☐ Medical Assistance (MA)? ☐ Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)? ☐ State Disability Assistance (SDA)? ☐ Child Development and Care (CDC)? ☐ Direct Support Services (DSS)? ☐ State SSI Payments (SSP)? 			
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 ☐ received: ☐ FIP ☐ FAP ☐ MA ☐ AMP ☐ S	SDA 🖂 CDC	☐ DSS ☐ SSP	

benefits.

2.	On June 29, 2014, the Department	
	denied Claimant's application	
	due to excess income.	

- 3. On June 10, 2014, the Department sent Claimant/Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) its decision.
- 4. On June 17, 2014, Claimant/Claimant's Authorized Hearing Representative (AHR) 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 Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE and XX of the Social Security Act, 42 USC 601-619, 670-679c, and 1397-1397m-5; the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 1990, PL 101-508, 42 USC 9858 to 9858q; and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, PL 104-193. The program is implemented by 45 CFR 98.1-99.33. The Department administers the program pursuant to MCL 400.10 and provides services to adults and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and Mich Admin Code, R 400.5001-.5020.

Additionally, the income limit for CDC benefits is for the claimant's group size. RFT 270. Claimant's income is Claimant did not contest that this was her countable income.

Therefore, as claimant's countable income exceeded the income limit for CDC benefits, the Department was correct to close claimant's CDC case.

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

□ acted in accordance with Department policy when it closed claimant's CDC benefts.

DECISION AND ORDER

Accordingly, the Department's decision is

 \boxtimes AFFIRMED.

Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: August 12, 2014
Date Mailed: August 12, 2014

RJC/tm

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 client;
- 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

