

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 15-006197  
Issue No.: 6001  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: June 04, 2015  
County: Genesee-District 6

**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 June 04, 2015, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of the Department included [REDACTED].

**ISSUE**

Did the Department of Health and Human Services (Department) properly deny the Claimant's Child Development and Care (CDC) application?

**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 February 13, 2015, the Claimant applied for Child Development and Care (CDC) benefits requesting child care during her school activities.
2. On February 26, 2015, the Department notified the Claimant that her Child Development and Care (CDC) application had been denied for having no verified need.
3. On April 8, 2015, the Department received the Claimant's request for a hearing protesting the denial of her Child Development and Care (CDC) application.

**CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

Department policies are contained in the Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), Department of Health and Human Services Reference

Tables Manual (RFT), and Department of Health and 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.

There are four valid CDC need reasons. Each parent of the child needing care must have a valid need reason during the time child care is requested. Each need reason must be verified and exists only when each parent is unavailable to provide the care because of:

1. Family preservation.
2. High school completion.
3. An approved activity.
4. Employment. Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 703 (November 1, 2014), p 4.

Online educational programs can only be approved if all of the following three requirements are met:

- Attendance is mandatory.
- The number of required hours of online attendance time is verified.
- Attendance is required at specific, regularly scheduled times. If the program is self-paced and can be completed at any time, care cannot not be approved for this need reason. BEM 703, p 10.

In this case, the Claimant applied for CDC benefits on February 13, 2015. The Claimant requested child care assistance so that she could take on-line classes. On February 26, 2015, the Department denied the Claimant's application because she did not have a valid need for child care that the Department can grant CDC benefits.

The Claimant did not dispute that her classes do not have scheduled attendance periods and that she is able to perform her school work at her own pace.


Department policy requires that each parent requesting child care assistance have a valid need during the period that child care is requested. The Claimant's need for child care to take online classes does not fit the definition of a valid need as defined by BEM 703 because they do not have regularly scheduled attendance times.

Administrative Law Judges have no authority to make exceptions to the Department policy set out in the program manuals. Furthermore, administrative adjudication is an exercise of executive power rather than judicial power, and restricts the granting of equitable remedies. *Michigan Mutual Liability Co. v Baker*, 295 Mich 237; 294 NW 168 (1940).

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 the Claimant's Child Development and Care (CDC) application for lack of a valid need as defined by Department policy.

**DECISION AND ORDER**

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

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Kevin Scully  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Nick Lyon, Director  
Department of Health and Human Services

Date Signed: **6/9/2015**

Date Mailed: **6/9/2015**

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 48909-8139

cc:

