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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.:	2012-41145
Issue No.:	2006
Case No.:	
Hearing Date:	July 18, 2012
County:	Wayne (15)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Michael J. Bennane

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Admini strative 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 July 18, 2012, fr om Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the claimant. Participants on be half of the Dep artment of Human Services (Department) included FIM.

ISSUE

Due to a failure to comply with the ve rification requirements, did the Department properly \prod deny Claimant's application \bigotimes close Claimant's case \prod reduce Claimant's benefits for:

Family Independence Program (FIP)? Food Assistance Program (FAP)? Medical Assistance (MA)?

State Disability Assistance (SDA)? Child Development and Care (CDC)?

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the competent, material, and substantia evidence on the whole record, including testimony of witnesses, finds as material fact:

1. Cla imant applied for was receiving: FIP FAP MA SDA CDC.

- 2. Claimant was required to submit requested verification by February 1, 2012.
- 3. On March 1, 2012, the Department denied Claimant's application.
 - Closed Claimant's case.

reduced Claimant's benefits .

- 4. On February 18, 2012, the Department sent notice of the denial of Claimant's application.
 - $\overline{\boxtimes}$ closure of Claimant's case.

reduction of Claimant's benefits.

5. On March 15, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the denial of claimant's application.

 $\overline{\boxtimes}$ closure of Claimant's case.

reduction of Claimant's benefits.

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 Family Independence Progr am (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and W ork Opportunity Reconc iliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 42 USC 601, *et seq*. The Department (formerly k nown as the Family Independence Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq*., and 1997 AACS R 400.3101-3131. FI P replac ed the Aid to Depe ndent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996.

☐ The Food Assistanc e Program (FAP) [for merly 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 1997 AACS R 400.3001-3015

The Medical Ass istance (MA) program is es tablished by the Title XIX of the Soc ial Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the F amily Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105.

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) progr am which provides financial as sistance for disabled persons is established by 2004 PA 344. The Depart ment (formerly known as the F amily Independence Agency) admini sters the SDA program pursuant to M CL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 1998-2000 AACS R 400.3151-400.3180.

☐ The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is establis hed by Titles IVA, IVE and XX of the Soc ial Security Act, the Ch ild Care and Developm ent 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. T he Department provides servic es to adult s and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and 1997 AACS R 400.5001-5015.

Additionally, on January 17, 2012, the department sent the claimant a redetermination packet, due February 1, 2012. The claimant testified that she mailed t he redetermination pack et to the department and called numerous times. The first call occurring, according to the claimant, Januar y 21, 2012. The department stated it had no record of these calls. The claimant also testified that she mailed the redetermination packet, and made copies of same, but did not present the copy at the hearing. BAM 130.

Based upon the abov e Findings of Fact and Conclus ions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department properly improperly

 \boxtimes 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 Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, finds that the Department \square did act properly \square did not act properly.

Accordingly, the Depar tment's decision is	REVERSED for the
reasons stated on the record.	

Michael J. Bennane Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: August 8, 2012

Date Mailed: August 8, 2012

NOTICE: Michigan Administrative Hearing S ystem (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.

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 at Michigan Administrative Hearings

- Re consideration/Rehearing Request
 - P. O. Box 30639 Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

MJB/cl

CC:			