

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 201238000  
Issue No.: 3008  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: April 4, 2012  
County: Washtenaw County DHS

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Corey A. Arendt

**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 4, 2012, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED]. 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  deny Claimant's application  close Claimant's case  reduce Claimant's benefits for:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP)?        | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA)? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC)?  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA)?                  |   |

**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  applied for  was receiving:  FIP  FAP  MA  SDA  CDC.
2. On February 16, 2012, the Claimant  was  was not provided with a verification checklist form (DHS-3503).
3. Claimant was required to submit requested verification by February 27, 2012.
4. Between February 16, 2012 and February 27, 2012, the Claimant returned to the Department only part of the documentation requested. The Claimant turned in everything except verification of her last 30 days of check stubs.

5. On March 2, 2012, 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 March 2, 2012, the Department sent notice of the  
 denial of Claimant's application.  
 closure of Claimant's case.  
 reduction of Claimant's benefits.
7. On March 2, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the  
 denial.     closure.     reduction.

### **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 FAP [formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) program] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 1999 AC, R 400.3001 through Rule 400.3015.

The Claimant admitted she received the verification checklist on or around February 16, 2012. However, the Claimant argued she received only the first page of the two page verification request form. The Claimant testified she read the first page in its entirety. It is undisputed that the first page of the verification form indicates there is a second page that corresponds with the first page. Therefore, because the Department indicates they sent both pages of the verification form and because the Claimant made no inquiry into the whereabouts or existence of the allegedly missing second page, I find that more likely than not, the Claimant received both pages and accidentally or intentionally failed to submit the remaining verification documents.

Based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, I conclude that the Department properly denied the Claimant's FAP application.

**DECISION AND ORDER**

I find, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, find the Department did act properly.

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

/s/  
Corey A. Arendt  
Administrative Law Judge  
For Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: April 6, 2012

Date Mailed: April 6, 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 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 **MAY** 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

CAA/cr

cc:

