OTDA-4357-EL (Rev. 10/01) GIS 10 TA/DC026

UPSTATE AND NYC MESSAGE

GENERAL INFORMATION SYSTEM Center for Employment & Economic Supports

November 23, 2010 Page: 1

	nissioners, TA & FS Directors, Investigation Supervisors, Legal Affairs and Fair ng Supervisors
FROM: Rus	ssell Sykes, Deputy Commissioner, Center for Employment and Economic Supports
SUBJECT:	<u>Clark v. Astrue</u> : Temporary Assistance (TA) and Food Stamps (FS) Policy for Probation and Parole Violators
EFFECTIVE DATE: Immediately	
CONTACT I	PERSON: A&QI/Program Integrity: Stephen Bach (518) 402-0117 <u>Stephen.Bach@otda.state.ny.us</u> ; TA Policy: Greg Nolan 1-800-343- 8859, extension 4-9101 <u>Greg.Nolan@otda.state.ny.us</u> ; FS Policy: Thomas Hedderman (518) 486-6939 <u>Tom.Hedderman@otda.state.ny.us</u>

The purpose of this General Information System (GIS) message is to notify the social services districts of an adverse federal court decision in the case of <u>Clark</u>, et. al. v. <u>Astrue</u> and the impact it will have on TA and FS parole/probation violator policy.

On March 19, 2010, the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit decided <u>Clark, et.</u> <u>al. v. Astrue.</u> The essence of the decision, as it pertains to applicants for and recipients of FS and TA, is that there be more than a warrant issued on the basis of probable cause or reasonable suspicion to believe that someone is violating a condition of probation or parole: The court held that such warrants are not equivalent to a determination that one is in fact violating a condition of probation or parole. Such warrants merely constitute evidence that one is violating one's probation or parole, but do not establish that such warrants meet the necessary evidentiary standard of establishing that the alleged violation actually exists.

Therefore, districts must not deny or discontinue TA or FS benefits on the basis of a warrant issued on the basis of an **alleged** probation or parole violation because practically all such warrants do not constitute a determination of violation but, instead, are mere allegations of violation.

A more detailed directive regarding this policy will be forthcoming.