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

п	1 TI		BA A	T-	ΓFR		┏.
П	u II	HE	IVI	۱ı	ırk	U	-

Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	2012-47808 2006 August 27, 2012 Wayne (82-18)				
vez					
SION					
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 27, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Participants. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included					
Due to a failure to comply with the verification requirements, did the Department properly \square deny Claimant's application \boxtimes close Claimant's case \square reduce Claimant's benefits for:					
State Disability As Child Developme	ssistance (SDA)? nt and Care (CDC)?				
ACT					
•	rial, and substantial s as material fact:				
TIP □FAP ☑MA [□SDA □CDC.				
rification by March	16, 2012.				
	Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County: Vez SION ive Law Judge pure for a hearing. from Detroit, Michie articipants on behavior Claimant's case State Disability A Child Developme FACT competent, mate of witnesses, find TIP FAP MA				

3.	On March 20, 2012, the Department denied Claimant's application. closed Claimant's case. reduced Claimant's benefits.
	On March 20, 2012, the Department sent notice of the denial of Claimant's application. closure of Claimant's case. reduction of Claimant's benefits.
	On April 16, 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 I Age 313	The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal sponsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, USC 601, <i>et seq</i> . The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence ency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, <i>et seq</i> ., and 1997 AACS R 400.3101-31. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective cober 1, 1996.
prog imp Reg Age	The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) gram] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is elemented 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 pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1997 AACS R 0.3001-3015
Sec The	The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social curity Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the program pursuant to MCL 400.10, <i>et seq.</i> , and MCL 400.105.
for as	The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program which provides financial assistance disabled persons is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department (formerly known the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 0.10, et seq., and 1998-2000 AACS R 400.3151-400.3180.
and	The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE IXX of the Social Security Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 30, 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.

Claimant testified that he failed to receive the interview notice that scheduled an inperson interview for March 16, 2012, to continue his MA benefits. While an in-person interview is not strictly required for MA benefits, the Department testified that Claimant could have called the Department and done the interview over the phone with no penalty and, thus, the Department is not in violation of this requirement.

Claimant also testified that when he failed to receive notice of the interview, he attempted on several times to contact his caseworker, but did not receive a response. The Administrative Law Judge finds this credible. It is noted on the interview sheet that Claimant's caseworker was not the one in charge of the interview, and was not the caseworker who was handling Claimant's MA redetermination, which could have caused confusion. Claimant testified to calling his caseworker's phone number, but was unaware of the phone number of the worker who was actually handling his interview. Claimant testified that he was not able to reach his caseworker, which is credible, as this caseworker was not handling the interview process.

The Department representative presenting the case was not the person taking the actions in question and, therefore, could not present any evidence rebutting Claimant's allegations. As the Administrative Law Judge generally found Claimant credible, and as no evidence was presented to rebut the claims presented, the undersigned has no choice but to hold that the evidence presented shows that Claimant did not receive the interview notice. As such, the Department was in error when it closed Claimant's case.

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
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 Department's decision is \square AFFIRMED \boxtimes REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.
☐ 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 redetermination in question, and reopen Claimant's MA case retroactive to the date of negative action.

Robert J. Chavez

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

Date Signed: September 5, 2012

Date Mailed: September 5, 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 **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

RJC/pf

CC: