

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

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

MAHS Reg. No.: 15-015906
Issue No.: 1001
Agency Case No.: ██████████
Hearing Date: October 12, 2015
County: Macomb (20-Warren)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Michael J. Bennane

HEARING DECISION

Following Petitioner'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 October 12, 2015, from Detroit, Michigan. Petitioner was represented by Petitioner. The Department of Health and Human Services (Department) was represented by ██████████

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

ISSUE

Did the Department properly close Petitioner's Family Independence Program (FIP) benefits case for failure to cooperate with the OCS?

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 June 7, 2015, the Department sent Petitioner the first customer contact letter requesting information about the noncustodial parent of ██████████
2. On August 3, 2015, the Department sent Petitioner a notice of case action informing her that her FIP benefits case was scheduled to close September 1, 2015, for failure to cooperate with the OCS
3. On August 28, 2015, Petitioner requested a hearing to protest the closure of her FIP benefits case.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

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

In this case, the Department closed Petitioner's FIP benefits case due to Petitioner's failure to provide parental information about one of her children, [REDACTED]

After swearing in Petitioner, this Administrative Law Judge questioned her about the information she had not supplied to the OCS. This Administrative Law Judge reminded Petitioner that she was under oath. This Administrative Law Judge then asked Petitioner if she had any information about the father of [REDACTED]. Petitioner testified that she had provided the OCS with all the information she had about the father of her child. Petitioner testified that she made a mistake and that the liaison that resulted in the birth of her child was a one-time occurrence and that she had no further information about the father of [REDACTED]

This Administrative Law Judge then asked the OCS whether they had any evidence or knowledge that Petitioner had further information concerning the father of her child. The OCS representative testified that he did not have evidence or knowledge that Petitioner had further information of the father of her child.

In *Black v Dept of Social Services*, 195 Mich App 27 (1992), the Court of Appeals addressed the issue of burden of proof in a non-cooperation finding. Specifically, the court in *Black* ruled that to support a finding of non-cooperation, the agency has the burden of proof to establish that the mother (1) failed to provide the requested verification and that (2) the mother knew the requested information. The *Black* court also emphasized the fact that the mother testified under oath that she had no further information and the agency failed to offer any evidence that the mother knew more than she was disclosing. *Black* at 32-34.

Here, Petitioner testified that she had no further information to supply to the Department or to the OCS.


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 closed Petitioner's FIP benefits case.

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. Reinstate Petitioner's FIP benefits retroactively to August 3, 2015, and supplement for any missed benefits.



Michael J. Bennane
Administrative Law Judge
for Nick Lyon, Director
Department of Health and Human Services

Date Signed: **11/24/2015**

Date Mailed: **11/24/2015**

MJB / pf

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]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]