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

DEI ARTIMENT OF HOMA	II OLIVIOLO		
IN THE MATTER OF:			
	Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	201213230 3008 December 19, 2011 Macomb County DHS (36)	
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Andrea J. Brad	ley		
HEARING DECIS	SION		
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 December 19, 2011, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant, Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included Eligibility Specialist.			
<u>ISSUE</u>			
Due to a failure to comply with the verification requirements, did the Department properly \boxtimes deny Claimant's application \square close Claimant's case \square reduce Claimant's benefits for:			
	_	ssistance (SDA)? ent and Care (CDC)?	
FINDINGS OF FA	<u>ACT</u>		
The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the evidence on the whole record, including testimony		•	
1. Claimant ⊠ applied for □ was receiving: □FI	P ⊠FAP □MA	□SDA □CDC.	

3. Claimant was required to submit requested verification by October 6, 2011.

2. Claimant was was not provided with a Verification Checklist (DHS-3503).

4.	The Department extended the deadline for the submission of the requested information on two occasions based on changes within the Department.
5.	On November 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 November 1, 2011, the Department sent notice of the denial of Claimant's application. closure of Claimant's case. reduction of Claimant's benefits.
7.	On November 14, 2011, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the denial. closure. 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 jency) 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 Jency) 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, Clients must cooperate with the local DHS office in obtaining verification for determining initial and ongoing eligibility. BAM 130. The questionable information might be from the client or a third party. Id. The Department can use documents, collateral contacts or home calls to verify information. Id. The client should be allowed 10 calendar days to provide the verification. If the client cannot provide the verification despite a reasonable effort, the time limit to provide the information should be extended at least once. BAM 130. If the client refuses to provide the information or has not made a reasonable effort within the specified time period, then policy directs that a negative action be issued. BAM 130.
In this case, the Department testified that the deadline to provide the requested verifications was extended twice due to changes in the Department. The Claimant was put on notice on October 6, 2011 that the Department was not in possession of the requested verifications. The information was not submitted to the Department until November 9, 2011, which was after case closure. The Claimant presented insufficient evidence that, pursuant to the October 6, 2011 notice and extension, that he submitted the requested verifications in the time allotted. To that end, the Department has established that it acted in accordance with Department policy when denied the Claimant's September 26, 2011 application for refusal to cooperate with the verification process.
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 \square did act properly. \square did not act properly.
Accordingly, the Department's decision is \boxtimes AFFIRMED \square REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.

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

Date Signed: 12/28/11

Date Mailed: <u>12/28/11</u>

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/hw

cc: