

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 201154761  
Issue No.: 5008  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: November 23, 2011  
County: Macomb DHS (12)

**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 following Claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on November 23, 2011, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED], Specialist.

**ISSUE**

Due to a failure to comply with the verification requirements, did the Department properly  deny Claimant's application  close Claimant's case  reduce Claimant's benefits for:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA)? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP)?     | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC)?  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA)?           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Emergency Relief? |

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

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:  FIP  FAP  MA  SDA  SER.
2. Claimant  was  was not provided with a Verification Checklist (DHS-3503-SER).
3. Claimant was required to submit requested verification by 7/21/11.

4. On 7/22/11, the Department  
 denied Claimant's application  
 closed Claimant's case  
 reduced Claimant's benefits  
for failure to submit verification in a timely manner.
5. On 7/22/11, the Department sent notice of the  
 denial of Claimant's application.  
 closure of Claimant's case.  
 reduction of Claimant's benefits.
6. On 8/1/11, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the  
 denial.    closure.    reduction.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

The State Emergency Relief (SER) program is established by 2004 PA 344. The SER program is administered pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and by 1999 AC, Rule 400.7001 through Rule 400.7049. Department policies are found in the State Emergency Relief Manual (ERM).

SER is a program which offers assistance for various client emergencies. Clients may seek assistance through SER for any of the following: heat or gas bills, water bills, electricity bills, home repairs, rent or mortgage arrearages, relocation expenses including rent and security deposit, food, burials or migrant hospitalization.

Clients must be informed of all verifications that are required and where to return verifications. ERM 103 at 5. The due date is eight calendar days beginning with the date of application. *Id.* Specialists are to use the DHS-3503-SER, SER Verification Checklist (VCL), to request verification and to notify the client of the due date for returning the verifications. *Id.*

In the present case, DHS denied Claimant's SER application due to Claimant's failure to verify employment income. Claimant and her mother were each working at the time Claimant submitted her SER application. DHS mailed Claimant a VCL (Exhibit 1) as required by policy. The VCL gave Claimant the proper time frame (eight days, starting with the date of application) to return verification of income. It was not disputed that Claimant returned her verification on 7/22/11, one day after the verification was due and the same date that the application was denied (see Exhibit 2).

Claimant gave various remarks concerning attempts to call her worker during and after the application process. If Claimant established some delay outside of her control in obtaining the needed verification and reporting that delay to DHS, it could result in a finding that the DHS denial was inappropriate. For clarification purposes, Claimant was asked to specify for what reason she called her worker prior to the application denial. Claimant responded that she called her worker primarily to find out why she was denied.

This statement tends to show that Claimant did not contact her work prior to the denial, only after the denial. Based on Claimant's response, this was not sufficient to negate the application denial.

Ideally, Claimant would have been advised by DHS to reapply immediately. Unfortunately, no remedy can be offered for the alleged failure by DHS to inform Claimant of this procedure.

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  AFFIRMED  REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.

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

Date Signed: 12/1/11

Date Mailed: 12/1/11

**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 **MAY** 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

cc:

