

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 14-013091  
Issue No.: 3011, 5011, 6011  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: November 5, 2014  
County: Kent-District 1 (Franklin)

**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 November 5, 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], Eligibility Specialist [REDACTED], and Family Independence Manager [REDACTED].

It will be noted that [REDACTED] was expected to participate on behalf of the Office of Child Support (OCS). Several calls were made to her because the critical issue in this matter was a finding that Claimant was not in cooperation with the OCS. Each call went to voice mail. The hearing proceeded without participation on the part of the OCS.

**ISSUE**

Did the Department properly deny Claimant's application for Food Assistance Program (FAP), Child Development and Care (CDC) and State Emergency Relief (SER)?

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

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

1. On April 14, 2014 Bridges was updated to reflect reported non-compliance with the OCS.
2. Claimant applied for FAP, CDC and SER on August 24, 2014.
3. On August 26, 2014, the Department mailed a Verification Checklist (VCL) to Claimant, with a due date of September 5, 2014. (Exhibit 1 Page 16.)

4. On August 29, 2014, the Department denied Claimant's application for CDC and SER because of the reported non-compliance. (Exhibit 1 Pages 18-21.)
5. On September 19, 2014, the Department denied Claimant's application for FAP because she had not responded to the VCL.
6. The Department received Claimant's hearing request on September 25, 2014.

### **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 273. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1-.119b, and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001 to .3015.

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 State Emergency Relief (SER) program is established by the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1-.119b. The SER program is administered by the Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) pursuant to MCL 400.10 and Mich Admin Code, R 400.7001 through R 400.7049.

"Clients must cooperate with the local office in determining initial and ongoing eligibility. This includes completion of necessary forms; see Refusal to Cooperate Penalties in this item. Clients must completely and truthfully answer all questions on forms and in interviews." BAM 105.

Per BAM 130, at page 6, says:

Verifications are considered to be timely if received by the date they are due. For electronically transmitted verifications (fax, email or Mi Bridges document upload), the date of the transmission is the receipt date. Verifications that are submitted after the close of regular business hours

through the drop box or by delivery of a DHS representative are considered to be received the next business day.

Send a negative action notice when:

The client indicates refusal to provide a verification, **or**

The time period given has elapsed and the client has **not** made a reasonable effort to provide it.

The issue relative to FAP is whether the Claimant provided timely verification in response to the request. The Claimant did not deny that she did not provide verification of her income.

The issue with respect to CDC and SER is more complex. The OCS alleged that Claimant has not cooperated in identifying the father of her child. Through the Department, the OCS provided letters addressed to Claimant on the topic of her reported non-cooperation. See Exhibit 2.

The Department's philosophy and policy with respect to child support cooperation is found in BEM 255.

"Families are strengthened when children's needs are met. Parents have a responsibility to meet their children's needs by providing support and/or cooperating with the department, including the Office of Child Support (OCS), the Friend of the Court (FOC) and the prosecuting attorney to establish paternity and/or obtain support from an absent parent." "The custodial parent or alternative caretaker of children must comply with all requests for action or information needed to establish paternity and/or obtain child support on behalf of children for whom they receive assistance, unless a claim of good cause for not cooperating has been granted or is pending."

When it comes to FIP, CDC Income Eligible, MA and FAP,

"Failure to cooperate without good cause results in disqualification. Disqualification includes member removal, as well as denial or closure of program benefits, depending on the type of assistance (TOA); see Support Disqualification in this item."

At page 9 of BEM 255, the applicant's responsibility to cooperate with respect to child support is described more fully:

Cooperation is required in all phases of the process to establish paternity and obtain support. It includes **all** of the following:

Contacting the support specialist when requested.

Providing all known information about the absent parent.

Appearing at the office of the prosecuting attorney when requested.

Taking any actions needed to establish paternity and obtain child support (including but not limited to testifying at hearings or obtaining genetic tests).

The penalties for failure to cooperate are found at page 13. The penalty in the FAP is: "Failure to cooperate without good cause results in disqualification of the individual who failed to cooperate. The individual and his/her needs are removed from the FAP EDG for a minimum of one month. The remaining eligible group members will receive benefits."

The Claimant testified persuasively that she has provided the information she has concerning parentage of her child. The OCS did not participate in the hearing, and there is no evidence to explain how the Claimant has been non-cooperative.

The Department provided a copy of an email sent to the Department on August 29, 2014. See Exhibit 1 Page 4. In that email, the Department said, "The customer was advised to contact DHS to file a hearing based on the fact that she has provided OCS with all the information that she has on the non-custodial parent and let a hearing judge decide if the information she provided is enough to lift the non-cooperation." That cavalier attitude is inappropriate. The OCS can effectively impose a sanction on a Claimant by insisting that she has not cooperated with their office. That sanction causes a denial of benefits until it is overturned. If the OCS is confident enough to impose such a de facto sanction, it should be confident enough to stand by its decision at an administrative hearing. If, on the other hand, it is not confident enough in its decision to testify at a hearing, then it should not be imposing the sanction. Furthermore, if it does not intend to participate in the hearing, it should at least have the courtesy to answer the telephone when the ALJ calls and make its position clear on the record. Even better, it should submit a written statement that it will not be participating in the hearing so the parties and the ALJ do not have to spend the time trying to make a fruitless connection.

The burden is on the Department to show that it properly determined Claimant's eligibility for MA.

When the Department presents a case for an administrative hearing, policy allows the Department to use the hearing summary as a guide when presenting the evidence, witnesses and exhibits that support the Department's position. See BAM 600, page 28. But BAM 600 also requires the Department to **always** include the following in planning the case presentation: (1) an explanation of the action(s) taken; (2) a summary of the policy or laws used to determine that the action taken was correct; (3) any clarifications by central office staff of the policy or laws used; (4) the facts which led to the conclusion

that the policy is relevant to the disputed case action; (5) the DHS procedures ensuring that the client received adequate or timely notice of the proposed action and affording all other rights. See BAM 600 at page 28. This implies that the Department has the initial burden of going forward with evidence during an administrative hearing.

Placing the burden of proof on the Department is a question of policy and fairness, but it is also supported by Michigan law. In *McKinstry v Valley Obstetrics-Gynecology Clinic, PC*, 428 Mich 167; 405 NW2d 88 (1987), the Michigan Supreme Court, citing *Kar v Hogan*, 399 Mich 529; 251 NW2d 77 (1979), said:

The term “burden of proof” encompasses two separate meanings. 9 Wigmore, *Evidence* (Chadbourn rev), § 2483 et seq., pp 276 ff.; McCormick, *Evidence* (3d ed), § 336, p 946. One of these meanings is the burden of persuasion or the risk of nonpersuasion.

The Supreme Court then added:

The burden of producing evidence on an issue means the liability to an adverse ruling (generally a finding or a directed verdict) if evidence on the issue has not been produced. It is usually cast first upon the party who has pleaded the existence of the fact, but as we shall see, the burden may shift to the adversary when the pleader has his initial duty. The burden of producing evidence is a critical mechanism in a jury trial, as it empowers the judge to decide the case without jury consideration when a party fails to sustain the burden.

The burden of persuasion becomes a crucial factor only if the parties have sustained their burdens of producing evidence and only when all of the evidence has been introduced. See *McKinstry*, 428 Mich at 93-94, quoting McCormick, *Evidence* (3d ed), § 336, p 947.

In other words, the burden of producing evidence (i.e., going forward with evidence) involves a party’s duty to introduce enough evidence to allow the trier of fact to render a reasonable and informed decision. Thus, the Department must provide sufficient evidence to enable the Administrative Law Judge to ascertain whether the Department followed policy in a particular circumstance.

Claimant testified that she has given the Department all of the information she has to identify the father of her child. She has given them his name, a physical description, his date of birth, tattoos, and where they met. The Department (particularly the OCS) did not provide any evidence as to what additional information the Claimant is expected to provide. Claimant has established that she is in compliance with the OCS.

The Department has not provided sufficient evidence to enable the ALJ to ascertain whether the Department followed policy when it denied Claimant’s application for SER and CDC due to non-cooperation with the OCS.

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 denied Claimant's application for FAP, but did not act in accordance with Department policy when it found that she was in non-compliance with the OCS.

**DECISION AND ORDER**

Accordingly, the Department's decision is **AFFIRMED IN PART** with respect to FAP and **REVERSED IN PART** with respect to CDC and SER.

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. The Department shall take steps to see that Claimant's OCS sanction is deleted from Bridges.
2. The Department shall initiate the recertification and reprocessing of Claimant's application for CDC and SER benefits dated August 25, 2014.



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

Date Signed: **11/10/2014**

Date Mailed: **11/10/2014**

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 48909-8139

cc:

