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

١	IN	J '	т	Н	F	N	ΙΔ	T	ΓΕ	R	0	F	•
ı	ı,					IV				\mathbf{r}	v		_

	Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	2012-44698 2006 August 20, 2012 Wayne (82-82)			
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Robert J. Ch	avez				
HEARING DEC	CISION				
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 August 20, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant's Authorized Hearing Representative (AHR), Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included					
ISSUE					
Due to a failure to comply with the verificati properly ⊠ deny Claimant's application ☐ close 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 the evidence on the whole record, including testimor	•	-			
1. Claimant ⊠ applied for ☐ was receiving: ☐	FIP □FAP ⊠MA	□SDA □CDC.			
2. Claimant was required to submit requested v	erification by Janua	ary 17, 2012.			

 3. On February 6, 2012, the Department ☐ denied Claimant's application. ☐ closed Claimant's case. ☐ reduced Claimant's benefits . 	
 4. On February 6, 2012, the Department sent notice of the ☐ denial of Claimant's application. ☐ closure of Claimant's case. ☐ reduction of Claimant's benefits. 	
 5. On March 29, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the	
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW	
Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridge Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).	€S
☐ The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Person Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-1942 USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independent Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1997 AACS R 400.310 3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effect October 1, 1996.	93, nce 01-
☐ The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp (Fprogram] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and implemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Fede Regulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independent Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1997 AACS 400.3001-3015	is eral nce
∑ The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Soc Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFI The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers to MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MCL 400.105.	R).
☐ The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program which provides financial assistant for disabled persons is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department (formerly knowns the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to M 400.10, et seq., and 1998-2000 AACS R 400.3151-400.3180.	wn
☐ The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, I' and XX of the Social Security Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant	

Date Signed: August 23, 2012

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 1997 AACS R 400.5001-5015.

The evidence provided by the Department shows that the Department failed to send the verification checklist in question to Claimant's AHR. The verification checklist has the incorrect address; the address is instead a hybrid address consisting of two addresses for Claimant's AHR. Claimant's AHR testified that she did not receive the verification checklist, and the Administrative Law Judge finds this credible given the incorrect address. BAM 105 guarantees that an authorized representative is entitled to the same documentation as a claimant. Therefore, as the AHR was not sent a copy of the verification checklist, the Department was incorrect to deny the application for failing to return verifications.

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
 ☐ 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 ightharpoonup did act properly in did not act properly.
Accordingly, the Department's decision is $\hfill \square$ AFFIRMED $\hfill \boxtimes$ REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.
\boxtimes THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO DO THE FOLLOWING WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER:
1. Reprocess the MA application in question.
Robert J. Chavez Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director

Department of Human Services

Date Mailed: August 23, 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 <u>MAY</u> 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

RJC/pf

