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

IN	THE	MAI	TER	OF:

	Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	201141842 2006 September 12, 2011 Wayne (82)		
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Christian Garde	ocki			
HEARING DECIS	SION			
This matter is before the undersigned Administrati and MCL 400.37 following Claimant's request telephone hearing was held on September Participants on behalf of Claimant included Participants on behalf of Department included, DHS Manager, and	for a hearing. 12, 2011, from of	After due notice, a Detroit, Michigan. rvices (Department)		
ISSUE				
Due to a failure to comply with the verification properly ⊠ deny Claimant's application ☐ close benefits for:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	:		
<u> </u>	State Disability As Child Developme	ssistance (SDA)? nt and Care (CDC)?		
FINDINGS OF FACT				
The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the evidence on the whole record, including testimony				
Claimant ⊠ applied for □ was receiving: □F	IP □FAP ⊠MA [□SDA □CDC.		
2. Claimant ⊠ was ☐ was not provided with a Ve	erification Checklis	st (DHS-3503).		
Claimant was required to submit requested ver	ification by 9/27/1	0.		

⊠ d □ c □ r	/30/10, the Department enied Claimant's application osed Claimant's case educed Claimant's benefits ellure to submit verification in a timely manner.
	/30/10, the Department sent notice of the enial of Claimant's application. osure of Claimant's case. eduction of Claimant's benefits.
	/8/11, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the enial. closure. reduction.
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
•	nent policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Manual (BEM) and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).
Respon 42 USC Agency 3131.	Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal sibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193 601, et seq. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1997 AACS R 400.3101 FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effectives 1, 1996.
progran implement Regulat	Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is ented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federa ons (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1997 AACS F1-3015
Security The De	Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Socia Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) partment (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the gram pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MCL 400.105.
for disa as the	State Disability Assistance (SDA) program which provides financial assistance bled persons is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department (formerly known family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL et seq., and 1998-2000 AACS R 400.3151-400.3180.
	Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE of the Social Security Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant or

1990, and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. The program is implemented by Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 98 and 99. The Department provides services to adults and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and 1997 AACS R 400.5001-5015.

BAM 600 contains the DHS policy for administrative hearings including the client deadline to file a hearing request. Clients have 90 calendar days from the date of the written notice of case action to request a hearing. BAM 600 at 4.

In the present case, DHS referenced a potential issue with the timeliness of Claimant's hearing request. It would appear that Claimant's hearing request was untimely based on a 9/30/10 DHS notice date and 6/8/11 hearing request date. Unfortunately, the issue was not developed at the hearing. As a result, neither side addressed the issue with any specifics.

There are possible arguments that could have been made by Claimant's AHR concerning the issue that might have made the request timely. It is possible that Claimant's AHR failed to receive the written notice. It is possible that a sooner hearing request was made. As it stands, an issue was already made on the merits concerning the underlying issue which amounts to a finding that the hearing request was submitted timely. DHS has a right to a reconsideration or rehearing if it is still contended that the issue was improperly decided.

Concerning the issue of the timeliness of Claimant's verifications. It was not disputed that Claimant's AHR timely submitted required verifications, but did so to the improper DHS office. DHS regulations do not appear to specifically address whether a submission to one DHS office satisfies a request from a separate office. DHS regulations allow hearing requests to be submitted anywhere within DHS requests (see BAM 600), but there is no comparable policy concerning verifications.

For MA benefits, clients are given 10 calendar days to provide requested verification. *Id.* at 5. If the client cannot provide the verification despite a reasonable effort, the time limit can be extended up to three times. *Id* at 6. DHS is to 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. *Id.* at 5.

There is no reason to believe that the AHR document submission to a DHS office separate from the one making the verification request was anything other than an innocent mistake. There was certainly no refusal to submit the documents. Mistakes are an inevitable part of everyone's day and the undersigned is hesitant to read a lack of reasonable effort based on an innocent mistake. The AHR's efforts were reasonable. Accordingly, DHS should not have sent a negative action notice and the denial of Claimant's application was improper.

Based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department properly improperly
 ☐ closed Claimant's case. ☐ denied Claimant's application. ☐ reduced Claimant's benefits.
DECISION AND ORDER
The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, finds that the Department did act properly. did not act properly.
Accordingly, the Department's decision is $\hfill \square$ AFFIRMED $\hfill \boxtimes$ REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.
\boxtimes THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO DO THE FOLLOWING WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER:
 Reinstate Claimant's application dated 8/4/09; Initiate processing of the application in accordance with DHS regulations.
Christian Gardocki
Chrtistian Gardocki Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services
Date Signed: September 15, 2011
Date Mailed: September 15, 2011
NOTICE: Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS) 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. MAHS will not order a rehearing or

the mailing date of this Decision and Order. MAHS 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 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.

Claimant may request a rehearing or reconsideration for the following reasons:

2011-41842/CG

- A rehearing <u>MAY</u> be granted if there is newly discovered evidence that could affect the outcome of the original hearing decision.
- A reconsideration **MAY** be granted for any of the following reasons:
- misapplication of manual policy or law in the hearing decision,
- typographical errors, mathematical error, or other obvious errors in the hearing decision that effect the substantial rights of the claimant;
- the failure of the ALJ to address other relevant issues in the hearing decision

Request must be submitted through the local DHS office or directly to MAHS by mail at Michigan Administrative Hearings
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request
P.O. Box 30639
Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

CG/hw

