

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES

ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE  
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN THE MATTER OF: [REDACTED],  
Claimant

Reg. No: 2010-8207  
Issue No: 4003  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Load No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date:  
June 24, 2010  
Kent County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Janice G. Spodarek

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on June 24, 2010.

ISSUE

Did the DHS properly deny claimant's SDA application on the grounds that necessary verifications were not returned?

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

- (1) On July 23, 2009, claimant applied for SDA.
- (2) On August 4, 2009, the DHS issued a request for medical evidence from [REDACTED].

(3) Claimant was working with [REDACTED] and gave permission to the department to speak to [REDACTED] regarding the failure of the medical clinic to return the requested documentation. Neither claimant nor [REDACTED] subsequently delivered the requested verifications.

(4) The department credibly testified that there was communication between the DHS and [REDACTED] regarding the requested medical which was not returned.

(5) On September 21, 2009, the DHS denied claimant's application on the grounds that claimant failed to comply with the DHS request for verification.

(6) On September 30, 2009, claimant filed a hearing request. Claimant indicated on her hearing request that [REDACTED] was representing her at the administrative hearing.

(7) On October 30, 2009, [REDACTED] filed a letter in this case stating in part:

... We do not have practicing lawyers on staff and do not represent anyone during hearings. I am happy to come with [claimant] as a support person but will not be her representative.

(8) [REDACTED] did not appear for the administrative hearing.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program which provides financial assistance for disabled persons is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human Services (DHS or department) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MAC R 400.3151-400.3180. Department policies are found in the Program Administrative Manual (PAM), the Program Eligibility Manual (PEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

General verification policy and procedure states in part:

## **DEPARTMENT POLICY**

### **All Programs**

Clients have rights and responsibilities as specified in this item.

The local office must do **all** of the following:

- . Determine eligibility.
- . Calculate the level of benefits.
- . Protect client rights. PAM, Item 105, p. 1.

### **All Programs**

Clients must completely and truthfully answer all questions on forms and in interviews. PAM, Item 105, p. 5.

### **Responsibility to Report Changes**

#### **All Programs**

This section applies to all groups **except** most FAP groups with earnings.

Clients must report changes in circumstances that potentially affect eligibility or benefit amount. Changes must be reported **within 10 days**:

- . after the client is aware of them, or
- . the start date of employment. PAM, Item 105, p. 7.

### **Verifications**

#### **All Programs**

Clients must take actions within their ability to obtain verifications. DHS staff must assist when necessary. See PAM 130 and PEM 702. PAM, Item 105, p. 8.

## **Assisting the Client**

### **All Programs**

The local office must assist clients who ask for help in completing forms (including the DCH-0733-D) or gathering verifications. Particular sensitivity must be shown to clients who are illiterate, disabled or **not** fluent in English. PAM, Item 105, p. 9.

## **Obtaining Verification**

### **All Programs**

Tell the client what verification is required, how to obtain it, and the due date (see “**Timeliness Standards**” in this item). Use the DHS-3503, Verification Checklist, or for MA redeterminations, the DHS-1175, MA Determination Notice, to request verification. PAM, Item 130, p. 2.

Send a negative action notice when:

- . the client indicates refusal to provide a verification, **or**
- . the time period given has elapsed and the client has not made a reasonable effort to provide it. PAM, Item 130, p. 4.

### **MA Only**

Send a negative action notice when:

- . the client indicates refusal to provide a verification, **or**
- . the time period given has elapsed. PAM, Item 130, p. 4.

## **VERIFICATION AND COLLATERAL CONTACTS**

### **DEPARTMENT POLICY**

#### **All Programs**

**Verification** means documentation or other evidence to establish the accuracy of the client's verbal or written statements.

Obtain verification when:

- . required by policy. PEM items specify which factors and under what circumstances verification is required.

- . required as a local office option. The requirement **must** be applied the same for every client. Local requirements may **not** be imposed for MA, TMA-Plus or AMP without prior approval from central office.
- . information regarding an eligibility factor is unclear, inconsistent, incomplete or contradictory. The questionable information might be from the client or a third party. PAM, Item 130, p. 1.

Verification is usually required at application/redetermination **and** for a reported change affecting eligibility or benefit level. PAM, Item 130, p. 1.

The client must obtain required verification, but you must assist if they need and request help. PAM, Item 130, p. 2.

In this case, the department's request for verification--what was needed and when was not submitted as evidence nor was it clearly identified in the evidentiary record. The department is required to send a 3503. However, unrefuted evidence on the record indicates that the department communicated with an individual assisting claimant in the application process. Claimant did not dispute that she gave permission to the department to speak with the representative. The department informed the representative that the requested medical documentation was not timely returned. However, there was evidently no follow through as there was no evidence returned timely in this case with regards to claimant's application.

After careful review of the credible and substantial evidence on the whole record, this ALJ finds that the facts in this case do indicate more probable than not that the department has complied with its verification policy and procedure and that claimant did not pursue and/or follow through with the requested verification(s). On this basis, this ALJ must find in favor of the department.

It is noted that claimant subsequently reapplied. Proper medical documentation was obtained and the MRT denied claimant.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides the department's actions were correct.

Accordingly, the department's actions are hereby UPHELD.

/s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
Janice G. Spodarek  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Ismael Ahmed, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: July 13, 2010

Date Mailed: July 14, 2010

**NOTICE:** Administrative Hearings may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a party within 30 days of the mailing date of this Decision and Order. Administrative Hearings will not order a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's motion where the final decision cannot be implemented within 90 days of the filing of the original request.

The Claimant may appeal the Decision and Order to Circuit Court within 30 days of the receipt of the Decision and Order or, if a timely request for rehearing was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the rehearing decision.

JGS/tg

cc:

