

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**



Reg. No.: 201240541  
Issue Nos.: 6019, 6043  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: April 26, 2012  
County: Shiawassee 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 26, 2012, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED].

**ISSUE**

Due to excess income, did the Department properly  deny the Claimant's application  close Claimant's case  reduce Claimant's benefits for:

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. Claimant  applied for benefits for:  received benefits for:

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

2. On January 18, 2012, the Claimant  was  was not provided with a verification checklist (DHS-3503).

3. Claimant was required to submit requested verification by January 30, 2012.
4. On February 15, 2012, the Department  denied Claimant's application  closed Claimant's case  reduced Claimant's benefits for failing to return requested verifications.
5. On February 15, 2012, the Department sent  Claimant  Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the  denial.  closure.  reduction.
6. On March 14, 2012, Claimant or Claimant's AHR filed a hearing request, protesting the  denial of the application.  closure of the case.  reduction of benefits.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

Department policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

The CDC program is established by Titles IVA, IVE and XX 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 Federal Regulations, Parts 98 and 99. The Department provides services to adults and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and 1999 AC, Rule 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.

Clients have the right to contest a Department decision affecting eligibility or benefit levels whenever it is believed that the decision is incorrect. The Department will provide an administrative hearing to review the decision and determine the appropriateness of that decision. (BAM 600).

Department policy indicates that clients must cooperate with the local office in determining initial and ongoing eligibility with all programs. (BAM 105). This includes completion of the necessary forms. Clients who are able to but refuse to provide necessary information or take a required action are subject to penalties. (BAM 105).

In this case, the Department mailed the Claimant a verification checklist on January 18, 2012. The Department sent the verification checklist to the Claimant's last known address on record.

Because the Claimant alleges to have not received the verification checklist in question, this issue concerns the application of "the mailbox rule."

Under the mailbox rule "a letter mailed in the due course of business is received." *Good v Detroit Automobile Inter-Insurance Exchange*, 67 Mich App 270 (1976). Such evidence is admissible without further evidence from the records custodian that a particular letter was actually mailed. *Good supra* at 275. "Moreover, the fact that a letter

was mailed with a return address but was not returned lends strength to the presumption that the letter was received." *Id* at 276. The challenging party may rebut the presumption that the letter was received by presenting evidence to the contrary. See *id*.

The Department has produced sufficient evidence of its business custom with respect to addressing and mailing of the verification in question. Under the mailbox rule, the mere execution of the DHS forms in the usual course of business rebuttably presumes subsequent receipt by the addressee. *Good v Detroit Automobile Inter-Insurance Exchange*, 67 Mich App 270 (1976). The Department has produced sufficient evidence of its business custom with respect to the mailing of the DHS verification allowing it to rely on this presumption. Claimant, on the other hand, argues that she did not receive the verification. Despite making this argument, Claimant has not come forward with sufficient evidence to rebut the presumption.

In regards to the notice provisions, timely notice is given for a **negative action** unless policy specifies adequate notice or no notice. A timely notice is mailed at least 11 days before the intended negative action takes effect. The action is pending to provide the client a chance to react to the proposed action. (BAM 220).

Policy in this case does not specify adequate notice or no notice when a Claimant's CDC benefits are closed due to failing to return requested verification. Therefore, Claimant is entitled to timely notice in this matter.

**Negative Actions:** If timely notice is required, the negative action date must be the first work day at least 11 days after the notice was sent, or the date the change is expected to occur if that is later. If adequate or no notice is required, the negative action date is immediate (the day action is taken on the change), but not before the change is expected to occur. (BAM 220).

CDC case closures and member removals (for example, removing an eligible child) take effect on the negative action date. (BAM 220).

In the present case, the Claimant did not return the requested verifications. However, this case turns on the notice provided to the Claimant regarding her case closure. Based on the testimony and exhibits presented, I find the Department did not provide the Claimant with timely notice as required by Department policy. Based on policy, the case closure is to take effect 11 days after the notice is issued. Because the notice in this case was issued on February 15, 2012, the closure should have occurred on February 27, 2012, and not February 15, 2012.

Based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, I find Department improperly closed Claimant's case for CDC 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 Department's  AMP  FIP  FAP  MA  SDA  CDC decision is  AFFIRMED  REVERSED.

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

1. Initiate a redetermination as to Claimant's eligibility for CDC benefits beginning February 15, 2011, and extending through February 27, 2012, and issue retroactive benefits if otherwise eligible and qualified.

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

Date Signed: April 27, 2012

Date Mailed: April 27, 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 **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.

201240541/CAA

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:

