

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 14-015766
Issue No.: 1008
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: December 11, 2014
County: MONROE

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Susanne E. Harris

HEARING DECISION

Following the 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 December 11, 2014, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of the Claimant included [REDACTED] and her husband, [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Hearing Facilitator, [REDACTED].

ISSUE

Did the Department properly close the Claimant's case for Family Independence Program (FIP)?

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

1. The Claimant received FIP benefits.
2. On December 1, 2014, the Department closed the Claimant's case due to the Claimant and her husband's noncompliance with employment related activities.
3. On November 3, 2014, the Department sent the Claimant its decision.
4. On November 3, 2014, the 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.

In this case, the Claimant's husband testified that he disagreed with the MRT's determination that he can work with limitations. The Claimant's husband testified that he disagreed even with the limitations set by the MRT. The Claimant and her husband were informed that there is no provision in departmental policy which allows for the Administrative Law Judge to revisit a determination of the MRT. It is not contested that the Claimant and her husband did not attend their PATH appointments and as the Claimant's husband could not verify a worsening medical condition, the Department found no good cause for their non-compliance.

Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 230A (2013) p. 14, provides that Claimants determined as work ready with limitations are required to participate in PATH as defined by MRT. BEM 230A (2013) p. 17, provides that when a Claimant determined by MRT to be work ready with limitations becomes noncompliant with PATH, the Claimant's worker is to follow instructions outlined in BEM 233A. BEM 233A (2013) p. 8, provides that the penalty for noncompliance without good cause is FIP case closure. As such, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department properly determined that the Claimant was non-compliance with employment related activities.

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 the Claimant's FIP case.

DECISION AND ORDER

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



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

Date Signed: **12/12/2014**

Date Mailed: **12/12/2014**

SEH/hj

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:

