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

IN THE MATTER OF:

	Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	2012-16608 2006 January 25, 2012 Oakland (03)		
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Michael J. Benr HEARING DECIS				
telephone hearing was held on J anuary 25, 2012, on behalf of Claimant included t he claimant's co	r a hearing. After from Detroit, Mic nservator and atto Participa	[·] due notice, a higan. <u>Participant s</u>		
Department of Human Services (Department) inclu	ueu			
<u>ISSUE</u>				
Due to a failure to comply with the ve rification requirements, did the Department properly deny Claimant's application close Claimant's case reduce Claimant's benefits for:				
		ssistance (SDA)? nt and Care (CDC)?		
FINDINGS OF FACT				
The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the cevidence on the whole record, including testimony				
1. Cla imant ⊠ applied for ☐ was receiving: ☐FIP ☐FAP ☑MA ☐SDA ☐CDC.				
2. Cla imant ⊠ was ☐ was not provided with a Ve	rification Checklis	st (DHS-3503).		

3. Claimant was required to submit requested verification by July 18, 2011.

4.	On July 20, 2011, 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 July 8, 2011, the Department sent notice of the ☐ denial of Claimant's application. ☐ closure of Claimant's case. ☐ reduction of Claimant's benefits.
6.	On October 24, 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 W ork Opportunity Reconc iliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly k nown 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 Assistanc e Program (FAP) [fo rmerly known as the Food Sta mp (FS) ogram] is establis hed by the Food St amp Act of 1977, as amend ed, 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 Ass istance (MA) program is es tablished by the Title XIX of the Soc ial curity Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the F amily Independence Agency) administers the A program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MCL 400.105.
for as	The State Disability Assistance (SDA) progr am which provides financial as sistance disabled persons is established by 2004 PA 344. The Depart ment (formerly known the F amily Independence Agency) administ ers the SDA program pursuant to M CL 0.10, et seq., and 2000 AACS, Rule 400.3151 through Rule 400.3180.
	The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is establishhed by Titles IVA, IVE d XX of the Soc ial 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 Fede ral Regulations, Parts 98 and 99. The Department provides services to adult and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and 1999 AC, Rule 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.

Additionally, The claim ant's attorney clai med that no denial notice was receiv ed in his office. However, the Verifica tion checklist and the notice of case action wer e both sent to the claimant at the conservator's office number and there is a I egal presumption that it was properly delivered.

In this case the request for verification was sent out on July 8, 2011, the notice of case action was also sent out on July 8, 2011, giving no time for a response.

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 Depar tment's decision is $\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$
$oxed{\boxtimes}$ THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO DO THE FOLLOWING WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER:
1. Reregister the May 31, 2011, MA application with retroactive MA.

Michael J. Bennane
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: February 14, 2012

Date Mailed: February 14, 2012

NOTICE: Michigan Administrative Hearing Syst em (MAHS) may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a par ty within 30 days of the receipt date of this Dec ision and Orde r. MAHS will not or der a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's mo tion where the final decis ion 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

Re consideration/Rehearing Request P. O. Box 30639 Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

MJB/cl

