
In the Matter of the Appeal of

M C

from a determination by the New York City
Department of Social Services

DECISION
: WITHOUT
EVIDENTIARY
HEARING
:

By letter dated October 26, 1988, the Appellant's representative, Eugene Doyle, requested that a decision without an evidentiary hearing be issued pursuant to 18 NYCRR 358.19 on a September 30, 1988 notice issued to the Appellant by the Agency. Pursuant to 18 NYCRR 358.19, by letter dated November 2, 1988, copies of the Appellant's request and supporting documents were sent to the Agency with a request for answering papers within ten working days. No evidence has been received from the Agency and the time to submit such evidence has expired.

FACT FINDINGS

An opportunity to be heard having been afforded to all interested parties and evidence having been submitted and due deliberation having been had, it is hereby found that:

1. Appellant has been in receipt of Public Assistance.
2. By notice dated September 30, 1988 the Agency notified the Appellant that his Public Assistance grant would be reduced effective October 14, 1988 to recoup a \$402.27 utility advance issued on September 23, 1988.
3. On October 26, 1988, the Appellant's representative, Eugene Doyle, requested that a decision without an evidentiary hearing be issued pursuant to 18 NYCRR 358.19 to determine whether the Agency's notice dated September 30, 1988 to recoup \$402.27 was defective because (a) it relies on a regulation which has no relevance to the charge specified in the notice; and (b) it fails to provide the details of the reason for the proposed recoupment.
4. Although requested to do so by letter dated November 2, 1988, the Agency has not submitted any evidence in opposition to the Appellant's allegations.

ISSUE

Was the Agency's notice dated September 30, 1988 to recoup a \$402.27 utility advance a proper notice?

1298320Z

APPLICABLE LAW

Federal Regulations at 45 CFR 205.10(a)(4)(ii) and Department policy (81 ADM-55) require that a notice of intent to reduce Aid to Dependent Children benefits cite the regulation upon which the proposed action is based.

Department Regulations at 18 NYCRR 358.8(a)(2) state that the notice must include details of the reasons for the proposed action.

DISCUSSION

The uncontroverted evidence establishes that, by notice dated September 30, 1988, the Agency advised the Appellant that the Agency intended to reduce his Public Assistance grant on October 14, 1988 to recover the amount of \$402.27 issued on September 23, 1988 to prevent a utility shut-off or to restore services. The notice advised the Appellant to see "State Regulation 352.7(g)(5)." Department Regulation 18 NYCRR 352.7(g)(5) relates to evictions for non-payment of shelter expenses for which a grant has been previously issued. It does not relate to the advancement of amounts to prevent the shut-off of or to restore utilities.

Although duly notified of the request for a decision without an evidentiary hearing pursuant to 18 NYCRR 358.19, the Agency did not produce any evidence that the notice dated September 30, 1988 was proper.

DECISION AND ORDER

The notice dated September 30, 1988 to recoup a \$402.27 utility advance was not a proper notice.

1. The Agency is directed to withdraw its notice dated September 30, 1988 and restore all lost benefits retroactive to October 14, 1988, the effective date of the Agency action.

2. The Agency is directed to continue assistance to the Appellant in the verified degree of need.


Should the Agency in the future determine to implement its previous action to recoup a \$402.27 utility advance, it is directed to issue a proper notice.

As required by Department Regulations at 18 NYCRR 358.22, the Agency must comply immediately with the directives set forth above.

DATED: Albany, New York

DEC 12 1988

CESAR A. PERALES
COMMISSIONER

BY 
Commissioner's Designee