

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2012-14252
Issue No.: 2001, 2006
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: April 10, 2012
County: Wayne

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: C. Adam Purnell

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 April 10, 2012, from Lansing, Michigan. Claimant personally appeared and provided testimony. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED]

ISSUE

Due to a failure to comply with the verification requirements, did the Department properly close Claimant's case for the Adult Medical Program (AMP)?

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 was receiving AMP benefits.
2. On September 14, 2011, the Department mailed Claimant a Redetermination packet (DHS-1010) which scheduled a telephone interview on October 3, 2011 at 4:15p.m.
3. Claimant was required to submit a completed Redetermination (DHS-1010) before October 3, 2011 so that the Department can conduct the telephone interview and determine continued eligibility.
4. Claimant did not return the Redetermination Packet (DHS-1010).

5. On October 20, 2011, the Department closed Claimant's case for failure to submit redetermination in a timely manner.
6. On October 20, 2011, the Department sent notice of the closure of Claimant's case.
7. On October 27, 2011, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the closure.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is available to individuals who meet all the eligibility factors in BEM 640. Certain aliens are limited to coverage of emergency services (ESO). BEM 640. Income eligibility exists when the program group's net income does not exceed the program group's AMP income limit. BEM 640. The AMP income limits are identified in RFT 236. When the client's living arrangement changes during a month, the department uses the living arrangement with the higher income limit. BEM 640. Only countable income is used. BEM 640. Countable income is income remaining after applying AMP policy in BEM 500, 501, 502, 503, 504. BEM 640.

Verification is usually required upon application or redetermination and for a reported change affecting eligibility or benefit level. BAM 130. Verifications are considered timely if received by the date they are due. BAM 130. The department must allow a client 10 calendar days (or other time limit specified in policy) to provide the requested verification. BAM 130. Should the client indicate a refusal to provide a verification or, conversely, if the time period given has elapsed and the client has not made a reasonable effort to provide it, the department may send the client a negative action notice. BAM 130.

Additionally, in accordance with Michigan law, it is presumed that a letter is received that is mailed in the due course of business. *Good v Detroit Automobile Inter-Insurance Exchange*, 67 Mich App 270 (1976). The proper mailing and addressing of a letter creates a presumption of receipt. That presumption may be rebutted by evidence. *Stacey v Sankovich*, 19 Mich App 638 (1969); *Good v Detroit Automobile Inter-Insurance Exchange*, 67 Mich App 270 (1976). The challenging party may rebut the presumption that the letter was received by presenting evidence to the contrary. See *id.*

Here, Claimant states that he did not receive the Redetermination (DHS-1010) although it was properly addressed to him. There was no evidence in the record that the DHS-1010 was returned as undeliverable. The Department has produced sufficient evidence of its business custom with respect to addressing and mailing of the Redetermination (DHS-1010) and the mere execution of the DHS-1010 in the usual course of business rebuttably presumes subsequent receipt by the addressee (Claimant). *Id.* Because the Department has produced sufficient evidence of its business custom with respect to the

mailing of the DHS-1010, it may rely on this presumption. Moreover, Claimant has not come forward with sufficient evidence to rebut the presumption.

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 closed Claimant's case.

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.

Accordingly, the Department's decision is AFFIRMED for the reasons stated on the record.

/s/
C. Adam Purnell
Administrative Law Judge
For Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 4/13/12

Date Mailed: 4/13/12

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 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.

CAP/ds



