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

(49)

IN THE MATTER OF:				
	Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	201153764 1005 October 19, 2011 Wayne County DHS		
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Andrea J. Bradley				
HEARING DECISION				
This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 following Claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on October 19, 2011, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant, Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included Ms. Ann Woodson, Family Independence Specialist.				
ISSUE				
Due to a failure to comply with the verification requirements, did the Department properly \square deny Claimant's application \boxtimes close Claimant's case \square reduce Claimant's benefits for:				
		ssistance (SDA)? nt and Care (CDC)?		
FINDINGS OF FA	<u>\CT</u>			
The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, including testimony of witnesses, finds as material fact:				
1. Claimant ☐ applied for ☒ was receiving: ☒FI	P	□SDA □CDC.		
2. Claimant ⊠ was ☐ was not provided with a Ve	rification Checklis	st (DHS-3503).		

3. Claimant was required to submit requested verification by August 15, 2011.

4.	The Claimant appeared at the Department on August 15, 2011 and dropped off the requested verifications.
5.	On September 1, 2011, the Department denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's case reduced Claimant's benefits for failure to submit verification in a timely manner.
6.	On August 15, 2011, the Department sent notice of the denial of Claimant's application. Closure of Claimant's case. reduction of Claimant's benefits.
7.	On September 9, 2011, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the denial. \boxtimes closure. \square reduction.
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
	epartment policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges gibility Manual (BEM) and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).
Re 42 Ag thr	The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal esponsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence gency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, Rule 400.3101 rough Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program fective October 1, 1996.
pro im Re Ag	The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) ogram] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is plemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal egulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence pency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, Rule 0.3001 through Rule 400.3015.
Se Th	The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social ecurity Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the Aprogram pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MCL 400.105.
for as	The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program which provides financial assistance disabled persons is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department (formerly known the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 0.10. et seq., and 2000 AACS, Rule 400.3151 through Rule 400.3180.

☐ The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE and XX of the Social Security Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 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 1999 AC, Rule 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.
Additionally, the Claimant offered credible testimony and documentary support for her contention that she appeared at the Department on August 15, 2011 to submit the requested verifications. The testimony established that the Department representative that participated in the hearing was assigned to the Claimant's matter at one point, but the requested verifications had another Department worker listed. In further support of this, the Claimant testified that she was instructed that the requested verifications would go to the newly listed Department worker. To that end, it is more likely than not that the confusion related to the assigned case worker contributed to the mishandling of the requested verifications, but that they were timely submitted.
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 ightharpoonup did act properly.
Accordingly, the Department's decision is $\hfill \square$ AFFIRMED $\hfill \boxtimes$ REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.
☑ THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO DO THE FOLLOWING WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER:
1. The Department shall initiate reprocessing of the Claimant's original application for FIP benefits in accordance with Department policy.

Claimant or issue a new medical determination verification checklist in accordance with Department policy.

2. The Department shall either locate and process the verifications submitted by the

3. The Department shall supplement the Claimant for lost benefits she was eligible and otherwise entitled to receive but-for the September 1, 2011 case closure.

Andrea J. Bradley
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 10/20/11

Date Mailed: 10/21/11

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 receipt 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. (60 days for FAP cases)

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.

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

- 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

AJB/di

