

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 201429692  
Issue No(s): 3006; 6006  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: June 16, 2014  
County: Macomb (20)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Robert J. Chavez

**HEARING DECISION**

Upon a hearing request by the Department of Human Services (Department) to establish an overissuance (OI) of benefits to Respondent, this matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9, 400.43a, and 24.201, *et seq.*, and Mich Admin Code, R 400.941, and in accordance with 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 June 16, 2014, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of the Department included [REDACTED], RS.

Respondent did not appear. This matter having been initiated by the Department and due notice having been provided to Respondent, the hearing was held in Respondent's absence in accordance with Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 725 (2014), pp. 16.

Participants on behalf of Respondent included [REDACTED].

**ISSUE**

Did Respondent receive an OI of

Family Independence Program (FIP)

State Disability Assistance (SDA)

Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits?

Child Development and Care (CDC)

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

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

1. Respondent was a recipient of  FIP  FAP  SDA  CDC benefits from the Department.
2. The Department alleges Respondent received a  FIP  FAP  SDA  CDC OI during the period March, 2012, through July, 2012 due to  Department's error  Respondent's error.
3. The Department alleges that Respondent received [REDACTED] amounts, that are still due and owing to the Department.

### 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 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.

Additionally, claimant does not protest the amount of the recoupment, whether there was an error, or allege in any way that the Department's recoupment calculation was in some way faulty. The Administrative Law Judge has reviewed the calculations for the months for which budgets were supplied and found no errors. There are no disputes as to the facts of the case.

Therefore, as the evidence shows that the calculations for the months for which budgets were supplied were correct, and as there is no dispute as to the calculation methods, and as the recoupment amount is over the threshold for recoupment for agency error as provided in policy, the Administrative Law Judge holds that the claimant received CDC and FAP benefits that they were not entitled to, and must repay the benefits through the recoupment process.

However, the Department failed to submit FAP budgets for the months of June and July, 2012. As such, the undersigned holds that the Department has failed to prove an overissuance for those months. As the Department has failed to prove an overissuance for those months, the Department may not recoup benefits for those months and the recoupment allowance will be reduced accordingly.

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, finds that the Department  did  did not

establish a  FAP  CDC benefit OI to Respondent totaling [REDACTED] in CDC and [REDACTED] in FAP benefits.

**DECISION AND ORDER**

Accordingly, the Department is

- AFFIRMED IN PART with respect to the fact that an overissuance occurred and REVERSED IN PART with respect to the amount of the FAP overissuance.
- The Department is ORDERED to initiate collection procedures for a [REDACTED] CDC and \$ [REDACTED] FAP OI in accordance with Department policy.



**Robert J. Chavez**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: August 8, 2014

Date Mailed: August 8, 2014

**NOTICE OF APPEAL:** A party may appeal this Hearing Decision in the circuit court in the county in which he/she resides or has its principal place of business in the State, 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

RJC/tm

cc:

