

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
MICHIGAN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING SYSTEM  
ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE  
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No: 2011-26519  
Issue No: 2006  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date:  
July 6, 2011  
Eaton County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Suzanne L. Morris

**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 July 6, 2011. The claimant appeared and provided testimony. Claimant was represented by [REDACTED].

**ISSUE**

Did the department properly deny the claimant's Medical Assistance (MA) application for failure to return the required verifications?

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

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

1. The claimant submitted an application for MA benefits on November 22, 2010.
2. On November 22, 2010, the claimant was mailed a Verification Checklist (DHS-3503), requiring proof of her checking account by December 2, 2010. (Department Exhibit 5)
3. The claimant was mailed a Notice of Case Action (DHS-1605) on December 6, 2010, that indicated her MA application was denied for failure to return the required verifications. (Department Exhibit 6 – 7)
4. The claimant submitted a hearing request on January 25, 2011.

## **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by Title XIX of the Social Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department of Human Services (DHS or department) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105. Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (bEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

Department policy states:

### **CLIENT OR AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES**

#### **Responsibility to Cooperate**

##### **All Programs**

**Clients must cooperate with the local office in determining initial and ongoing eligibility. This includes completion of the necessary forms. BAM 105.**

#### **Refusal to Cooperate Penalties**

##### **All Programs**

Clients who are able but refuse to provide necessary information or take a required action are subject to penalties. BAM 105.

#### **Verifications**

##### **All Programs**

Clients must take actions within their ability to obtain verifications. DHS staff must assist when necessary. See BAM 130 and BEM 702. BAM 105.

#### **Assisting the Client**

##### **All Programs**

The local office must assist clients who ask for help in completing forms (including the DCH-07 33-D) or gathering verifications. Particular sensitivity must be shown to clients

who are illiterate, disabled or **not** fluent in English. BAM 105.

Verification is usually required at application/redetermination **and** for a reported change affecting eligibility or benefit level. BAM 130.

## **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 Check list, or for MA redeterminations, the DHS-1175, MA Determination Notice, to request verification. BAM 130.

The client must obtain required verification, but you must assist if they need and request help.

If neither the client nor you can obtain verification despite a reasonable effort, use the best available information. If **no** evidence is available, use your best judgment. BAM 130.

### **Timeliness Standards**

#### **FIP, SDA, CDC, FAP**

Allow the client 10 calendar days ( **or** other time limit specified in policy) to provide the verification you request. BAM 130.

**Exception:** For CDC only, if the client cannot provide the verification despite a reasonable effort, extend the time limit at least once.

Verifications are considered to be timely if received by the date they are due. For electronically transmitted verifications (fax, email), the date of the transmission is the receipt date. Verifications that are submitted after the close of business hours through the drop box or by delivery of a DHS representative are considered to be received the next business day.

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. BAM 130.

**Note:** For FAP only, if the client contacts the department prior to the due date requesting an extension or assistance in obtaining verifications, you must assist them with the verifications but do not grant an extension. Explain to the client they will not be given an extension and their case will be denied once the VCL due date is passed. Also, explain their eligibility will be determined based on their compliance date if they return required verifications. Re-register the application if the client complies within 60 days of the application date; see BAM 115, Subsequent Processing. BAM 130.

Claimants are required to comply with the local office to allow the department to determine initial or ongoing eligibility. BAM 105. The department informs the client what verification is required, how to obtain it, and the due date by using the Verification Checklist form (DHS-3503). BAM 130. Clients are provided ten days to return the verifications, but can request an extension of time to provide the verifications. BAM 130. If the time period to provide the verifications elapses and the verifications have not been provided, the department is directed to send a negative action notice. BAM 130.

The claimant filed this hearing request to dispute the department's actions in denying her MA application for failing to return the required verifications. The department testified that the client never submitted any proof of her checking account, which was needed to determine the client's eligibility for the MA program.

Claimant testified that she received a verification checklist in the mail that required several documents, but did not request verification of her account. (See Claimant Exhibit A). The claimant testified that she does not remember receiving the Verification Checklist mailed by the department on November 22, 2010. The document shows that it was addressed to the claimant's proper address. The proper mailing and addressing of a letter creates a presumption of receipt. That presumption may be rebutted by evidence. *Stacey v Sankovich*, 19 Mich App 638 (1969); *Good v Detroit Automobile Inter-Insurance Exchange*, 67 Mich App 270 (1976).

However, this is a moot issue because the claimant testified that she knew she had to turn in verification of her checking account because she had a conversation with her case worker and was told to submit the bank statement. Claimant testified that she did turn in verification of her checking account by placing it in the mail on November 24, 2010 to the local office. The department representative looked through the entire case file and the only bank statement received from the claimant was the claimant's

boyfriend’s account statement that was date-stamped as received by the department on November 29, 2010.

The claimant’s representative provided a copy of the claimant’s bank statement that claimant testified she mailed to the department on November 24, 2010 (See Claimant Exhibit B – E). However, upon inspection of this document, it is clear that the claimant could not have mailed it to the department on November 24, 2010. The Chase bank statement covers the period from November 16, 2010 through December 14, 2010. Thus, it could not even have been issued to the claimant until after December 14, 2010. Contrary to the claimant’s testimony, this bank statement most certainly could not have been received by the department by the due date (December 2, 2010).

Therefore, the substantial and material evidence shows that the claimant did not submit verification of her checking account as required by the Verification Checklist and verbal conversation with the case worker. Therefore, when the time period to provide the verification lapsed without the verifications being received, the department properly denied the claimant’s application.

**DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the department properly denied the claimant's MA application for failure to turn in the required verifications.

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

Suzanne

\_\_\_\_\_  
*/s/*  
L. Morris  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: July 13, 2011

Date Mailed: July 18, 2011

**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.

2011-26519/SLM

The Claimant may appeal the Decision and Order to Circuit Court within 30 days of the mailing 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.

SM/ac

cc:

