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

### IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 14-017900

Issue No.: <u>6001</u>

Case No.: Hearing Date:

County:

January 14, 2015 Kent-District 1

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Kevin Scully** 

# **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, telephone hearing was held on January 14, 2015, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included and participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included participants on the Department of Human Services (Department) included participants on the Department of Human Services (Department) included participants on the Department of Human Services (Department) included participants on the Department of Human Services (Department) included participants of the Department of Human Services (Department) included participants of the Department of Human Services (Department) included participants of the Department of Human Services (Department of Human Services (

# ISSUE

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

# 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 is an ongoing Child Development and Care (CDC) recipient.
- 2. The Claimant has been eligible for Child Development and Care (CDC) with no lapse in benefits.
- On December 4, 2014, the Department received the Claimant's request for a hearing protesting the Department's failure to issue Child Development and Care (CDC) benefits for November of 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 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 Claimant is an ongoing Child Development and Care (CDC) recipient. The Department concedes that the Claimant was eligible for Child Development and Care (CDC) benefits in November of 2014, and has been eligible for benefits since then. The Department has requested a help desk ticket to resolve the Claimant's Child Development and Care (CDC) billing issues and continued to work on issuing the Child Development and Care (CDC) the Claimant is entitled to.

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 did not act in accordance with Department policy when it determined the Claimant's eligibility for Child Development and Care (CDC) benefits as of November 1, 2014.

# **DECISION AND ORDER**

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

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. Implement a help desk ticket to ensure the Claimant receives the Child Development and Care (CDC) benefits she is eligible for.
- 2. Initiate a determination of the Claimant's eligibility for the Child Development and Care (CDC) as of November 1, 2014.
- 3. Provide the Claimant with a Notice of Case Action (DHS-1605) describing the Department's revised eligibility determination.

4. Issue the Claimant any retroactive benefits she may be eligible to receive, if any.

Administrative Law Judge for Nick Lyon, Acting DHS Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 1/14/2015

Date Mailed: 1/14/2015

KS/las

**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

