

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**



Reg. No.: 201430346  
Issue No.: 2011  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: April 14, 2014  
County: Wayne (35)

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

**HEARING DECISION**

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 following Claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on April 14, 2014, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED], Human Facilitator.

**ISSUE**

Did the Department properly  deny Claimant's application  close Claimant's case for:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP)?  | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)?    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP)?      | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA)? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA)? | <input type="checkbox"/> 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. Claimant  applied for benefits  received benefits for:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP).  | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP).    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP).      | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA). |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA). | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC).  |

2. On December 1, 2013, the Department  
 denied Claimant's application     closed Claimant's case  
due to a child support noncooperation action.
3. On November 4, 2013, the Department sent  
 Claimant     Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)  
notice of the     denial.     closure, but failed to send notice to claimant's AR.
4. On February 27, 2014, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the  
 denial of the application.     closure of the case.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

Department policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105.

Regulations governing the Office of Child Support (OCS) can be found in the Office of Child Support Policy Manual (OCSPM).

Clients 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. Failure to cooperate without good cause results in disqualification. Disqualification includes member removal, denial of program benefits, and/or case closure, depending on the program. BEM 255.

Noncooperation exists when the custodial parent (CP) does not respond to a request for action or does not provide information, and the process to establish paternity and/or a child support order cannot move forward without the CP's participation. A CP is in noncooperation with the IV-D program when the CP, without good cause, willfully and repeatedly fails or refuses to provide information and/or take an action needed to establish paternity or to obtain child support or medical support. OCSPM 2.15. IV-D staff apply noncooperation to a CP only as a last resort when no other option is available to move the IV-D case forward. OCSPM 2.3.

There is no minimum information requirement. CPs can be required to provide known or obtainable information about themselves, the child(ren) for whom support is sought, and the non-custodial parent (NCP) when needed to obtain support. OCSPM 2.3.1.

In evaluating cooperation, the IV-D worker should consider such factors as the CP's marital status, the duration of his/her relationship with the NCP, and the length of time since the CP's last contact with the NCP. OCSPM 2.3.1.

A CP can be required to cooperate by attesting under oath to the lack of information regarding an NCP. This may assist in determining cooperation in cases in which a CP's willingness to cooperate is questionable but there is insufficient evidence for a finding of noncooperation. The IV-D worker is not required to provide a CP with the opportunity to attest under oath if the CP has not demonstrated a willingness and good-faith effort to provide information. In this situation, the IV-D worker must evaluate whether the CP has knowingly withheld information or given false information, and base a decision on that evidence. OCSPM 2.3.5.

With regard to the child support noncooperation sanction, no evidence was presented that this sanction was correct. The only evidence presented with regard to the accuracy of the sanction was testimony attesting that the claimant was under sanction—this testimony cannot be used to prove itself. None of this evidence shows exactly why claimant is under a sanction, whether claimant has actually failed to cooperate, or how claimant is noncooperative.

Simply put, the Administrative Law Judge has received no evidence as to whether the sanction is accurate, why claimant was sanctioned, whether a sanction is warranted, or if claimant even requires child support that would support a sanction. OCS did not testify, and no other evidence regarding the sanction was presented; therefore, as the Department has the burden of proof in these matters, the sanction cannot stand. Furthermore, per claimant testimony, claimant has cooperated to the best of their ability, and there is no evidence that this sanction was applied as a last resort, as required by policy.

Additionally, claimant was approved for MA benefits for September through November, 2013, and the sanction in question was applied starting January, 2013; the curious dates in this matter are further indication that the noncooperation penalty was an error.

Finally, it should be noted that claimant applied for retroactive benefits with their September, 2013 MA application; there is no proof that the retroactive application was processed, as the notice of case action in question made no mention of the retro benefits. This is plain error, and the retro benefits must be processed.

Based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> properly denied Claimant's application | <input type="checkbox"/> improperly denied Claimant's application     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> properly closed Claimant's case        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> improperly closed Claimant's case |

for:  AMP  FIP  FAP  MA  SDA  CDC.


**DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, finds that the Department  did act properly.  did not act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's decision in this case REVERSED.

THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO DO THE FOLLOWING WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER:

1. Remove the noncooperation sanction from claimant's case, and reopen claimant's MA benefits retroactive to December 1, 2013.
2. Process claimant's September, 2013 retroactive MA application.

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

Date Signed: May 1, 2014

Date Mailed: May 1, 2014

**NOTICE:** Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS) may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a party within 30 days of the mailing date of this Decision and Order. MAHS will not order a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's motion where the final decision cannot be implemented within 90 days of the filing of the original request. (60 days for FAP cases)

The Claimant may appeal the Decision and Order to Circuit Court within 30 days of the receipt of the Decision and Order or, if a timely request for rehearing was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the rehearing decision.

Claimant may request a rehearing or reconsideration for the following reasons:

- A rehearing **MAY** be granted if there is newly discovered evidence that could affect the outcome of the original hearing decision.
- A reconsideration **MAY** be granted for any of the following reasons:
  - misapplication of manual policy or law in the hearing decision,
  - typographical errors, mathematical error, or other obvious errors in the hearing decision that effect the substantial rights of the claimant:
  - the failure of the ALJ to address other relevant issues in the hearing decision.

2014-30346/RJC

Request must be submitted through the local DHS office or directly to MAHS by mail at  
Michigan Administrative Hearings  
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request  
P. O. Box 30639  
Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

RJC/tm

cc:

