## 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:	2012-33269 2006 June 7, 2012 Oakland (04)		
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Alice C. Elki	n			
HEARING DECISION				
This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 following Claim ant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a selephone hearing was held on June 7, 2012, from Detroit, Mi chigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant and Claimant's friend. Participants on behalf of Department of H uman Services (Department) included Eligibility Specialist.				
<u>ISSUE</u>				
Did the Departm ent properly $igtimes$ deny Claiman t's application $igsqcup$ close Claimant's case for:				
Family Independence Program (FIP)? Food Assistance Program (FAP)? Medical Assistance (MA)? Direct Support Services (DSS)?	☐ Adult Medical As ☑ State Disability A ☐ Child Developme			
FINDINGS OF FACT				
The Administrative Law Judge, based on the whole record, finds as material	e competent, materi fact:	al, and substantial		
1. Cla imant ☑ applied for benefits ☐ received ☐ Family Independence Program (FIP). ☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP). ☑ Medical Assistance (MA). ☐ Direct Support Services (DSS).	Adult Medical As	ssistance (AMP). Assistance (SDA). ent and Care (CDC).		

2.	On February 1, 2012, the Department
3.	On January 23, 2012, the Department sent  Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)  notice of the denial. Closure.
4.	On January 30, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the $\boxtimes$ denial of the application. $\square$ closure of the case.
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
	epartment policies are contained in the Br idges Administrative Manual (BAM), the idges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).
Re 42 Ag thr	The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established purs uant 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 lency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, R 400.3101 ough Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program lective 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 ency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, R 400.3001 ough Rule 400.3015.
Se Th Ag	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). e Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independ ence ency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MC L 0.105.
	The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is ministered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, <i>et seq</i> .
for Se pro	The State Disabilit y Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The D epartment of Human ervices (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA ogram pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 2000 AACS, R 400. 3151 through Rule 0.3180.

☐ The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is establis hed by Titles IVA, IVE and 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 Federal Regulations, Parts 98 and 99. The Department provides services to adults and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and 1999 AC, R 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.		
☐ Direct Support Services (DSS) is adminis tered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.57a, et. seq., and Mich Admin Code R 400.3603.		
Additionally, Claimant filed an application for MA and SDA on December 12, 2011. The Department initially s ent Claimant a Verification Checklist addressed to the wrong apartment number and containing paperwork listing a different party than Claimant a s the client. On December 15, 2011, the Department sent a new Medical Determination Verification Checklist, with additional forms for completion, to Claimant to the correct address, as verified by Claimant on the record, with a December 27, 20112 due date. The Department presented evidence showing that the documents were printed by central print in Lansing, which results in a computer producing the documents, inserting them in envelopes and sending them. Claimant testified that he did not receive these documents but did not believe he had any issues with his mail. Under these facts, Claimant has failed to rebut the presumption of receipt of the properly addressed and mailed documents. <i>Good v Detroit Automobile Inter-Insurance Exchange</i> , 67 Mich App 270 (1976). Thus, the Department acted in accordance with Department policy in denying Claimant's SDA and MA applications.		
Claimant is encouraged to reapply for benefits.		
Based upon the abov e Findings of Fact and Co nclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department		
<ul> <li>☑ properly denied Claimant's application</li> <li>☐ properly closed Claimant's case</li> <li>☐ improperly denied Claimant's application</li> <li>☐ improperly closed Claimant's case</li> </ul>		
for:		
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  $\square$  AMP  $\square$  FIP  $\square$  FAP  $\boxtimes$  MA  $\boxtimes$  SDA  $\square$  CDC  $\square$  DSS decision is  $\boxtimes$  AFFIRMED  $\square$  REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.

Alice C. Elkin
Administrative Law Judge
For Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: June 19, 2012
Date Mailed: June 19, 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 mailing date of this Dec ision and Order. 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 ti mely 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, math ematical error, or other obvious errors in the he aring 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

## ACE/cl

cc: