STATE OF MICHIGAN STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES

ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No: 2011-10220

Issue No: 6019

Case No:

Hearing Date: March 9, 2011

Calhoun County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Suzanne D. Sonneborn

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Admini strative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon Claimant's request for a hearing. After due no tice, a telephone hearing was held on March 9, 2011. Cla imant personally appeared and provided testimony.

<u>ISSUE</u>

Whether the department proper ly denied Claimant's Child Development and Car (CDC) benefit application for lack of verification?

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 September 29, 2010, Claimant applied for CDC benefits. (Department Exhibits 1-5).
- On October 18, 2010, the departm ent mailed Claimant a Verification Checklist (DHS 3503), r equesting that Claimant provide proof of her enrollment in an educ ational program by n o later than October 28, 2010, for purposes of det ermining her el igibility for the CDC p rogram. (Department Exhibits 6-7).
- 3. On November 8, 2010, the department mailed Clai mant a Notice of Case Action (DHS 1605), informing Claimant that her CDC application had been

- denied because Claimant failed to v erify necessary info rmation. (Department Exhibits 8-11).
- 4. On October 29, 2010, Claimant requested a hearing, protesting the denial of her CDC application.
- 5. The department's March 9, 2011, call detail inquiry indicates that the Calhoun County DHS office did not receive any calls from Claimant's telephone number during the months of October and November 2010. (Department Exhibit 12).

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Child Development and Care program is established by T itles IVA, IVE, and XX of the Social Security Act, the Child Care and Development Block Gr ant of 1990, and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. The program is implemented by T itle 45 of the Code of F ederal Regulations, Parts 98 and 99. The Department of Human Services (DHS or Department) provides services to adults and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and M AC R 400.5001-5015. Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), Reference Table Manual (RFT), and the Bridges Reference Manual (BRM).

Department policy provides that clients must cooperate with the local office in determining initial and ongoing e ligibility with all programs. This includes completion of the necessary forms. BAM 105. Department policy furthe r states that CDC payments will not be made until all eligibility and need requirements are met and care is being provided by an eligible provider. BEM 706. Eligibility and need requirements can not be determined until all forms have been received by the department. BEM 702.

Department policy further provid es that clients must take actions within their ability to obtain verifications and Department staff must assist when necessary. BAM 130, BEM 702. Verification is usually required at applic ation/redetermination and for a reported change affecting eligibility or benefit level. BAM 130. A client must be given 1 0 calendar days (or other time limit specified in policy) to provide the requested verification. If the client cannot provide the verification despite a reasonable effort, the department should extend the time limit at least once. BAM 130. The department should send a negative action notice when (i) the client indicates a refusal to provide a verification; or (ii) the time period give in has elaps ed and the cilent has not made a reasonable effort to provide it. BAM 130.

In this case, Claimant disputes the denial of her CDC application based on her failure to provide the requested verification. At the hearing, Claimant admitted she received the Verification Checklist requesting information on her enrollment in an education program by no later than October 28, 2010. Claimant testified that she hand-delivered the requested information (her class schedule) to the Calhoun County DHS office before the due date but could not specifically recall when she did so. Claim ant also testified that

she called the Calhoun Coun tv DHS office several ti mes after receiving the department's Notic e of Action to report that she had in fact timely pr oduced the requested information but, again, she could not recall specifically when she made these calls. In response, the department representative testified that, per office policy, each piece of mail received by the of fice is registered by the receptionist and all claimants must sign a log when delivering docum ents to the office. The department representative further testified that she re viewed the log in question and it did not contain Claimant's signature, nor was any mail registered by the receptionist as received from Claimant. Finally, the department representative performed a call detail inquiry on March 9, 2011, which indicated that the Calhoun County DHS office did not receive any calls from Claimant's telepho ne number during the months of October and November 2010. Consequently, based on the evidence presented at the hearing, Claimant was unable to provide competent, material and substantial evidence that she provided the department with the requested information in a tim ely fashion or that she asked for assistance in doing so.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusion sof law, decides that the department properly denied Claim ant's CDC application for failure to return the necessary verification.

Accordingly, the department's actions are UPHELD. SO ORDERED.

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

201110220/SDS

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 ti mely request for rehearing was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the rehearing decision.

SDS/alc

