#### STATE OF MICHIGAN

# MICHIGAN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS SYSTEM ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN THE MATTER OF:

IN THE MATTER OF

Reg. No. 201134743

Issue No. <u>3003</u>

Case No.

Hearing Date: June 16, 2011

Oakland County DHS (03)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Christian Gardocki

## **HEARING DECISION**

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon the c laimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on June 16, 2011. T he claimant appeared and testified. On behalf of Department of Human Services (DHS), Specialist, appeared and testified.

# <u>ISSUES</u>

- Whether DHS properly failed to proc ess Claimant's F ood Assistance Program
   (FAP) benefits for 1/2011 and 2/2011 based on Claimant's failure to timely
   submit income verifications.
- Whether DHS properly issued FAP benefits for 1/ 2011-4/2011 to Claimant without factoring insur ance premium and condominium fees when DHS did not request verification of those expenses.

### FINDINGS OF FACT

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

- 1. On 1/25/11, Claimant applied for FAP benefits.
- 2. Among other expenses, Claimant's application reported a monthly obligation for insurance premiums and condominium fees.
- On 1/27/11, DHS mailed a Verification Checklist (VCL) requesting verification of several items including unearned income , but not insurance premiums and condominium fees.

- 4. Claimant did not verif y her unearned incom e until 2/24/11, a date following the VCL due date.
- 5. DHS initially denied Claimant's application but reinstated the application effective 3/2011 based on Claimant's tardy unearned income submission.
- 6. On an unspecified date, DHS determined Claimant's FAP benefits for 3/2011 and 4/2011 as \$16/month, in part, by not fa ctoring Claimant's in surance premiums and condominium fees.
- 7. Claimant submitted verification of insurance premiums and condominium fees in 4/2011 to affect her FAP benefit issuance beginning 5/2011.
- 8. DHS did not issue F AP benefit s to Claimant for 1/2011 or 2/2011 based on Claimant's tardy income verification submission.
- 9. On 3/21/11, Claimant requested a hearing to dispute the failure by DHS to issue FAP benefits to Claimant for 1/2011 and 2/2011 and f or the failure by DHS to factor her insurance premiums and condom inium fees in the determinations for 3/2011 and 4/2011.

# **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

The Food Assistanc e Program (formerly known as the Food Stamp Program) is established by the Food Stam p Act of 1977, as amended, and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Feder al Regulations (CFR). DHS (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the FAP pursuant to Michigan Compiled Laws 400. 10, et seq., and Michigan Administrative Code R 400.3001-3015. DHS regulations are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT). Updates to DHS regulations are found in the Bridges Policy Bulletin (BPB).

The undersigned will refer to the DHS regulations in effect as of 2/2011, the month of the DHS decision which Claimant is dissputing. Current DHS manuals may be found online at the following URL: <a href="http://www.mfia.state.mi.us/olmweb/ex/html/">http://www.mfia.state.mi.us/olmweb/ex/html/</a>.

If the group is ineligible or refuses to cooper ate in the applic ation process, DHS is to certify the denial within the st andard of promptness to avoid receiving an ov erdue task in Bridges (the DHS database). BAM 115 at 16. Bridges sends a DHS 1605, Client Notice, or the DHS-1150, Application Eligibility Notice, with the denial reason(s). *Id*.

#### 201134743/CG

For FAP benefits, DHS is to proceed as follows when a client completes the application process after denial but within 60 days after the application date.

- On or before the 30th day, DHS is to re-register the application, using the original application date and if the client is eligible, determine whether to prorate benefits according to initial benefits policy.
- Between the 31st and 60th days, DHS is to re-register the app lication, using the date the client completed the process and if the client is eligible, DHS is to prorate benefits from the date the client complied. *Id*.

In the present case, it was not disputed that Claimant did not verify her income information until 2/24/11. Claimant also initially did not dispute the issue concerning the DHS failure to issue FAP benefits for 1/2011 and 2/2011; Claimant reversed her position at the very end of the hearing seem ingly because of a DHS failure to send a VCL for insurance premiums and condominium fees. Based on the presented evidence, there was enough to ascertain that DHS sent a VCL concerning Claimant's income and that Claimant verified the income on 2/24/11, a date subsequent to the VCL due date and the DHS denial of Claimant's application.

Based on Claimant's application date (1/25/11) and Claimant's income submission date (2/24/11), it is found that Claimant completed the application process on the 30 th day following her application date. Accordingly DHS should have re-registered Claimant's application for the original application date (1/25/11) and determined Claimant's FAP benefit eligibility beginning 1/25/11.

A request for program benefits begins with the filing of a DHS-1171 or other acceptable form. BAM 110 at 1. Before processing an application, DHS may r equire a client to verify information wit hin their application. Verification is usually required at application. BAM 130 at 1. DHS must give clients at least ten days to submit verifications. *Id.* 

DHS must tell the client what verification is required, how to obtain it, and the due date. *Id.* at 2. DHS is to use the DHS-3503, Verification Checklist, or for MA redeterminations, the DHS-1175, MA Determination Notice, to request verification. *Id.* at 3.

In the present case, DHS requested sev eral items from Claimant on a VCL dated 1/27/11; Claimant's insuranc e premiums and condominium fees were not among the requested items on the VCL.

When DHS process ed Claimant's initial FAP benefit eligibilit y, DHS did not factor the condo or insurance expenses because they were not verified. Though DHS regulations support not budgeting unverified expenses, the regulations mandate that DHS first request the verifications. The failure by DHS to do so in the present case deprived Claimant the opport unity to have thos expenses factored in her FAP budget

#### 201134743/CG

determinations for 1/2011-4/2011. Future m onths were not affected becaus e Claimant verified the expens es in 4/ 2011 which led DH S to begin budgeting the e xpenses beginning 5/2011. It is found that DHS s hould have factored Claimant's insurance premiums and condo fees in determining Claimant's FAP benefit eligibility for 1/2011-4/2011.

## **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds that DHS impressed upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds that DHS impressed upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds that DHS impressed upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds that DHS impressed upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds that DHS impressed upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds that DHS impressed upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds that DHS impressed upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds that DHS impressed upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds that DHS impressed upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds that DHS impressed upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds that DHS impressed upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds that DHS impressed upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds that DHS impressed upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, find the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, find the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, find the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, find the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, find the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, find the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, find the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, find the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, find the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, find the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, find the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, find the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, find the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, find the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, find the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, find the above find the above findings of fact and conclusion

- re-register Claimant's application effective 1/25/11;
- redetermine Claimant 's FA P benefit eligibility for 1/2011-4/2011 by inc luding Claimant's insurance premium and condominium fee expenses; and
- supplement Claimant for any FAP benefit s not received in the original FAP benefit issuance.

The actions taken by DHS are REVERSED.

Christian Gardocki
Christian Gardocki
Administrative Law Judge
For Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: June 24, 2011

Date Mailed: June 24, 2011

**NOTICE:** Administrative Hearings may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a party wit hin 30 days of the ma iling date of this Decision and Order. Administrative Hear ings will not orde r a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's mo tion where the final decis ion cannot be implemented within 60 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 of the rehearing decision.

CG/ctl

# 201134743/CG

CC:

Oakland County DHS (03)/1843

Christian Gardocki Administrative Hearings