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

(76)

IN THE MATTER OF:

	Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	2012 37942 3008 June 28, 2012 Wayne County DHS
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Lynn M. Fe	erris	
HEARING DI	ECISION	
This matter is before the undersigned Administrant MCL 400.37 following Claimant's requestelephone hearing was held on June 28, 2012 behalf of Claimant included the Claimant. Pathuman Services (Department) included Assistance Payments Supervisor.	est for a hearing. 2, from Detroit, Michi	After due notice, a gan. Participants on of the Department of
ISSU	E	
Due to a failure to comply with the verific properly ☐ deny Claimant's application ☒ clobenefits for:		
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)? ☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)? ☐ Medical Assistance (MA)?		assistance (SDA)? ent and Care (CDC)?
FINDINGS O	OF FACT	
The Administrative Law Judge, based upon evidence on the whole record, including testim	•	-
 Claimant ☐ applied for ☒ was receiving: 	∏FIP ∏FAP ⊠MA	□SDA □CDC.
2. Claimant was required to submit requested	verification by 1/3/12	2.
 On 3/1/12, the Department ☐ denied Claimant's application. 		

201237942/ LMF

☐ closed Claimant's case.☐ reduced Claimant's benefits .	
 4. On 2/18/12, the Department sent notice of denial of Claimant's application. ☑ closure of Claimant's case. ☑ reduction of Claimant's benefits. 	of the
 5. On 2/24/12, Claimant filed a hearing requ ☐ denial of claimant's application. ☐ closure of Claimant's case. ☐ reduction of Claimant's benefits. 	est, protesting the
CONCLUSIO	NS OF LAW
Department policies are found in the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Reference T	
☐ The Family Independence Program (FIP) Responsibility and Work Opportunity Record 42 USC 601, et seq. The Department (for Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 40 3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Deper October 1, 1996.	nciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, merly known as the Family Independence 00.10, et seq., and 1997 AACS R 400.3101-
☐ The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [program] is established by the Food Staimplemented by the federal regulations con Regulations (CFR). The Department (form Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MG 400.3001-3015	amp Act of 1977, as amended, and is ntained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal nerly known as the Family Independence
☐ The Medical Assistance (MA) program is Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 The Department (formerly known as the Far MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq	of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). mily Independence Agency) administers the
☐ The State Disability Assistance (SDA) properties of the State Disab	PA 344. The Department (formerly known nisters the SDA program pursuant to MCL
☐ The Child Development and Care (CDC) and XX of the Social Security Act, the Ch 1990, and the Personal Responsibility and Ward The program is implemented by Title 45 of	ild Care and Development Block Grant of Vork Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996.

and 99. The Department provides services to adults and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and 1997 AACS R 400.5001-5015.

Additionally, the evidence established that the Department sent the Claimant's Redetermination to the correct address on December 13, 2012 and did not receive the redetermination back from the Claimant. The Redetermination was sent to the correct address. Exhibit 3.

The Claimant testified that she did not receive the packet, as her grandmother might have opened it, and that she left for out of town on December 20, 2012. 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).

In this case, it is determined that the Claimant did not rebut the presumption of delivery and receipt by indicating that she had problems with her mail or that she was out of town and did not receive the redetermination. In this case the Department sent the redetermination 7 days prior to the Claimant leaving town, thus establishing that the redetermination should have been received in ample time to complete it prior to her leaving town. Additionally, the Claimant suggested that her grandmother may have received and opened the redetermination. This testimony did not establish that her grandmother received the redetermination. The only fact supporting this contention was that the Claimant's grandmother does live with her and thus she had access to the mail. As stated at the hearing, the Claimant may reapply for medical assistance at any time. Based upon these facts and law, it is determined that the redetermination was received and was not responded to by the due date.

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
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 not act properly.
Accordingly, the Department's decision is \boxtimes AFFIRMED \square REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.

☐ THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO DO THE FOLLOWING WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER:

1.

Lynn M. Ferris
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: July 3, 2012

Date Mailed: July 3, 2012

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. (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 to:

Michigan Administrative Hearings Reconsideration/Rehearing Request P. O. Box 30639 Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

LMF/hw

201237942/ LMF

