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

IN	IHE	MAI	IER	OF:

	Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	2012-40020 2006 June 28, 2012 Wayne (55)			
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Michael J. Bennane					
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 telephone hearing was held on June 28, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the claimant and behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included					
ISSUE	Ī				
Due to a failure to comply with the ve rification requirements, did the Department properly \boxtimes deny Claimant's application \square close Claimant's case \square reduce Claimant's benefits for:					
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)? ☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)? ☐ Medical Assistance (MA)?		assistance (SDA)? ent and Care (CDC)?			
FINDINGS OF FACT					
The Administrative Law Judge, based upon evidence on the whole record, including testime					
1. Cla imant ⊠ applied for ☐ was receiving: ☐FIP ☐FAP ☑MA ☐SDA ☐CDC.					
2. Claimant was required to submit requested verification by February 21, 2012.					

	On February 29, 2012, the Department ☑ denied Claimant's application. ☐ closed Claimant's case. ☐ reduced Claimant's benefits.
	On February 29, 2012, the Department sent notice of the included denial of Claimant's application. included claimant's case. included reduction of Claimant's benefits.
	On March 14, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the denial of claimant's application. closure of Claimant's case. reduction of Claimant's benefits.
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
	partment policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges gibility Manual (BEM) and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).
Res 42 l Age 313	The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal sponsibility 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 ency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1997 AACS R 400.3101-31. FI P replace ed the Aid to Depe ndent Children (ADC) program effective tober 1, 1996.
prog imp Reg Age	The Food Assistanc e Program (FAP) [fo rmerly known as the Food Sta mp (FS) gram] 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 gulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence ency) administers FAP pur suant to MCL 400. 10, et seq., and 1997 AACS R 0.3001-3015
Sec The	The Medical Ass istance (MA) program is es tablished by the Title XIX of the Soc ia curity Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). Department (formerly known as the F amily Independence Agency) administers the program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MCL 400.105.
for o	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 1998-2000 AACS R 400.3151-400.3180.
	The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is establishhed by Titles IVA, IVE IXX of the Social 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 sand children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and 1997 AACS R 400.5001-5015.

Additionally, the department deni ed the claimant's MA applic ation for failure to provide documentation requested by the department. At the hearing it became apparent to this Administrative Law J udge that the claima nt was either not understanding question s being asked of her, or the department was in danger of not understanding the claimant.

"Interpreters

Record the need for special language ac commodations and the applicant's primary spoken and written language on the Household Information screen in Bridges.

A client who needs a bi lingual interpreter must be informed that he may choose one of the following:

Arrangements for an interpreter by DHS, including payment of any costs.

Use of his or her own adult interpreter.

If the client does not identify his own interpr eter, select one of the following, if available, and inform the client:

DHS staff person with bilingual ability." (BAM 105, p. 10).

At the hearing the department testified that it had not used interpreters with this claimant previously.

In addition, the claimant provided inc ome information to the department but the department found it inadequate.

"The client must obtain required verification, but you must assist if they need and request help. If neither the client nor you can obtain verification despite a reasonable effort, use the best available information. If no evidence is available, us e your best judgment." (BAM 130, p. 3).

In the instant case the department failed to use the best information available and failed to provide an interpreter for a cl aimant that, in the opinion of this Administrative La w Judge, obviously needed one..

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	3
☐ 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 Conclusion of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, finds that the Department \square did not act properly.						
Accordingly, the Depar reasons stated on the re		AFFIRMED	□ REVERSED for the			
☐ THE DEPARTMENT			ING WITHIN 10 DAYS OF			

1. Reregister and proces s the claim ant's MA application of January 13, 2012, utiliz ing the information supplied by the claimant and providing an interpreter to obtain same.

Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: July 10, 2012

Date Mailed: July 10, 2012

NOTICE: Michigan Administrative Hearing System (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 order 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 **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

2012-40020/MJB

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

