

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

██████████  
██████████  
████████████████████

Reg. No.: 15-007246  
Issue No.: 1006; 1007  
Case No.: ██████████  
Hearing Date: June 10, 2015  
County: WAYNE-DISTRICT 17  
(GREENFIELD/JOY)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Eric Feldman**

**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; and Mich Admin Code, R 792.11002. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on June 10, 2015, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant, ██████████. Participants on behalf of the Department of Health and Human Services (Department or DHHS) included ██████████ Partnership. Accountability. Training. Hope. (PATH) Case Manager.

**ISSUE**

Did Claimant receive an overissuance of program benefits that the Department is entitled to recoup?

**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 is an ongoing recipient of the Family Independence Program (FIP - Cash) benefits. See Exhibit B, p. 1.
2. On April 10, 2015, the Department sent Claimant a Notice of Overissuance, which notified Claimant that she received more FIP benefits than she was eligible to receive for the time period of June 1, 2014 to November 30, 2014. See Exhibit A, pp. 4-8. The Notice of Overissuance further indicated the overissuance balance was ██████████ based on client error and did not provide any explanation of reason. See Exhibit A, p. 4.

3. On April 16, 2015, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the Department's action. See Exhibit A, p. 2.

### **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 Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-193, and 42 USC 601 to 679c. The Department (formerly known as the Department of Human Services) administers FIP pursuant to 45 CFR 233-260, MCL 400.10, the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1-.119b, and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3101-.3131.

When a client group receives more benefits than they are entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the overissuance (OI). BAM 700 (May 2014), p. 1. The amount of the OI is the benefit amount the group or provider actually received minus the amount the group was eligible to receive. BAM 715 (July 2014), p. 6.

A client/CDC provider error OI occurs when the client received more benefits than they were entitled to because the client/CDC provider gave incorrect or incomplete information to the department. BAM 715, p. 1.

In this case, the Department alleges that Claimant failed to timely report her employment and wages to the Department, which caused an overissuance of FIP benefits.

Clients must report changes in circumstance that potentially affect eligibility or benefit amount. BAM 105 (April 2014), p. 9. Changes must be reported within 10 days of receiving the first payment reflecting the change. BAM 105, p. 9.

Income reporting requirements are limited to the following:

- Earned income:
  - Starting or stopping employment.
  - Changing employers.
  - Change in rate of pay.
  - Change in work hours of more than five hours per week that is expected to continue for more than one month.

BAM 105, p. 9.

At the hearing, the Department testified that Claimant began employment in May 2014 in which she reported and verified to DHHS in July 2014. See Exhibit A, p. 1. The Department further testified that it did not process a budget to reflect the earnings until November 2014. See Exhibit A, p. 1.

In response, Claimant testified that she began employment early April 2014 and attempted via telephone to notify her DHHS and/or her PATH caseworker not until late April 2014. In the beginning of May 2014, Claimant testified that she sent her DHHS caseworker copies of her paystubs.

The local office and client or Authorized Hearing Representative (AHR) will each present their position to the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), who will determine whether the actions taken by the local office are correct according to fact, law, policy and procedure. BAM 600 (April 2015), p. 35. Both the local office and the client or AHR must have adequate opportunity to present the case, bring witnesses, establish all pertinent facts, argue the case, refute any evidence, cross-examine adverse witnesses, and cross-examine the author of a document offered in evidence. BAM 600, p. 36. The ALJ determines the facts based only on evidence introduced at the hearing, draws a conclusion of law, and determines whether DHHS policy was appropriately applied. BAM 600, p. 38.

Based on the foregoing information, the Department did not satisfy its burden of showing that it acted in accordance with Department policy when it failed to establish an OI amount for FIP benefits. BAM 600, pp. 35-38. There is possibly a client error present in this case as Claimant's testimony indicated that she failed to timely report her employment and wages to the Department. See BAM 105, p. 9. However, the Department has the burden of establishing how it calculated the OI amount. In the present case, the Department presented no evidence of how it calculated the OI amount, such as FIP budgets, verification of employment, etc... Thus, the Department is unable to establish an OI of FIP benefits in this case. BAM 600, pp. 35-38; BAM 700, p. 1; and BAM 715, p. 6.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

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, concludes that Claimant did not receive a FIP overissuance for which the Department presently seeks recoupment for the time period of June 1, 2014 to November 30, 2014 (in the amount of [REDACTED]).

Accordingly, the Department's action seeking recoupment is **REVERSED**.



**Eric Feldman**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Nick Lyon, Director  
Department of Health and Human Services

Date Signed: **6/12/2015**

Date Mailed: **6/12/2015**

EMF/tm

**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 copy of the claim or application for appeal must be filed with the Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS).

A party may request a rehearing or reconsideration of this Hearing Decision from 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:

[REDACTED]