


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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**



Reg. No.: 14-010213  
Issue No.: 6008  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: September 18, 2014  
County: Washtenaw (District 20)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Darryl Johnson**

**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 September 18, 2014, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Hearings Facilitator [REDACTED] and Eligibility Specialist [REDACTED].

**ISSUE**

Did the Department properly determine Claimant's Child Development and Care (CDC) benefits?

**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 an on-going CDC recipient.
2. On July 31, 2014, the Department mailed a Notice of Case Action (NCA) informing her that her CDC would be closed because she had not identified a valid childcare provider. (Exhibit 1 Pages 8-9.)
3. Claimant had provided verification of her childcare provider on July 30, 2014, (Exhibit 1 Pages 6-7).
4. On August 11, 2014, the Department received Claimant's hearing request.
5. On August 14, 2014, the Department updated Claimant's case and provided her with CDC to pay for 80% of the cost of 60 hours of childcare per pay period.

### **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 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.

The Department acknowledged that it erred when it closed Claimant's CDC. When Claimant requested a hearing, the Department corrected its error. Claimant then raised a question regarding the Department's action of reducing her benefit from 95% to 80% of her CDC. The witnesses agreed that Claimant's income had increased since her CDC was last reviewed October 25, 2013. At that time, her benefit was based on income of [REDACTED] per month. Her income subsequently increased to [REDACTED] per month, and now is [REDACTED] per month. Per RFT 270 (8/1/14) the child care benefit for someone earning between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] per month with one child is 80%. To receive 95%, she would have to have income of less than [REDACTED] per month.

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 originally erred in closing Claimant's CDC, but it subsequently cured that error by providing her with benefits. The Department acted in accordance with policy when it subsequently determined Claimant's CDC benefits.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

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



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

Date Signed: **9/22/2014**

Date Mailed: **9/22/2014**

DJ/jaf

**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

CC:

