



GRETCHEN WHITMER
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS
MICHIGAN OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES

ORLENE HAWKS
DIRECTOR

██████████
██████████
██████████, MI ██████████

Date Mailed: September 7, 2022
MOAHR Docket No.: 22-003272
Agency No.: ██████████
Petitioner: ██████████ ██████████

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Kevin Scully

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. After due notice, telephone hearing was held on August 30, 2022, from Lansing, Michigan. Petitioner was represented by ██████████ ██████████ Petitioner testified on her own behalf. The Department was represented by Susan Derseweh.

ISSUE

Did the Department of Health and Human Services (Department) properly deny Petitioner's request for cash assistance?

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. Petitioner applied for cash assistance.
2. On May 17, 2022, the Department notified Petitioner that she was not eligible for cash assistance for failure to return school verification or failure to cooperate with the Office of Child Support.
3. On ██████████ ██████████ the Department received Petitioner's request for a hearing protesting the denial of cash assistance.

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 through 679c. The Department administers FIP pursuant to 45 CFR 233 through 261, MCL 400.10, the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1 et seq, and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3101 through R 400.3131.

On [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] the Department received Petitioner's request for a hearing. At her hearing, Petitioner and her authorized hearing representative testified that they were protesting the denial of cash assistance and not protesting any other program.

The hearing record supports a finding that cash assistance was denied on May 17, 2022, and Petitioner's hearing request indicates that she is protesting the denial of cash assistance where notice of the denial was dated May 17, 2022.

The production of evidence to support the department's position is clearly required under BAM 600 as well as general case law (see e.g., *Kar v Hogan*, 399 Mich 529; 251 NW2d 77 [1976]). In *McKinstry v Valley Obstetrics-Gynecology Clinic, PC*, 428 Mich167; 405 NW2d 88 (1987), the Michigan Supreme Court addressed the issue of burden of proof, stating in part:

The term "burden of proof" encompasses two separate meanings. [citation omitted.] One of these meanings is the burden of persuasion or the risk of nonpersuasion. The other is the risk of going forward or the risk of nonproduction. The burden of producing evidence on an issue means the liability to an adverse ruling (generally a finding or a directed verdict) if evidence on the issue has not been produced. It is usually on the party who has pleaded the existence of the fact, but..., the burden may shift to the adversary when the pleader has discharged [its] initial duty. The burden of producing evidence is a critical mechanism[.]

The burden of persuasion becomes a crucial factor only if the parties have sustained their burdens of producing evidence and only when all of the evidence has been introduced.

McKinstry, 428 Mich at 93-94, quoting McCormick, Evidence (3d ed), Sec. 336, p. 946.

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 failed to satisfy its burden of showing that it acted in accordance with Department policy when it denied cash assistance on May 17, 2022.


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. Initiate a determination of the Petitioner's eligibility for the Family Independence Program (FIP) effective May 1, 2022.
2. Provide the Petitioner with written notice describing the Department's revised eligibility determination.
3. Issue the Petitioner any retroactive benefits she may be eligible to receive, if any.

KS/nr



Kevin Scully
Administrative Law Judge
Michigan Office of Administrative Hearings
and Rules (MOAHR)

NOTICE OF APPEAL: A party may appeal this Order in circuit court within 30 days of the receipt date. A copy of the circuit court appeal must be filed with the Michigan Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules (MOAHR).

A party may request a rehearing or reconsideration of this Order if the request is received by MOAHR within 30 days of the date the Order was issued. The party requesting a rehearing or reconsideration must provide the specific reasons for the request. MOAHR will not review any response to a request for rehearing/reconsideration.

A written request may be mailed or faxed to MOAHR. If submitted by fax, the written request must be faxed to (517) 763-0155; Attention: MOAHR Rehearing/Reconsideration Request.

If submitted by mail, the written request must be addressed as follows:

Michigan Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request
P.O. Box 30639
Lansing, Michigan 48909-8139

Via Electronic Mail:

DHHS

Susan Dersweh
Genesee County DHS Clio Rd Dist.
4809 Clio Road
Flint, MI 48504

Interested Parties

Genesee Clio County DHHS
BSC2
G. Vail
B. Cabanaw

Via First Class Mail:

Petitioner

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED], MI [REDACTED]

Authorized Hearing Rep.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED], MI [REDACTED]