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

IN THE MATTER OF:

	Reg. No.: Issue Nos.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	2012-53533 2006; 3008 June 20, 2012 Oakland (63-02)		
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Robert J. Chavez				
HEARING DECIS	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 June 20, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included				
ISSUE				
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:				
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐		ssistance (SDA)? nt and Care (CDC)?		
FINDINGS OF F	<u>ACT</u>			
The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, including testimony of witnesses, finds as material fact:				
Claimant applied for MA and was receiving FA	Р.			
. Claimant was required to submit requested verification by May 4, 2012.				
 3. On May 7, 2012, the Department ☑ denied Claimant's MA application. ☑ closed Claimant's FAP case. 				

2012-53533/RJC

	reduced Claimant's benefits .
4.	On May 7, 2012, the Department sent notice of the ☐ denial of Claimant's MA application. ☐ closure of Claimant's FAP case. ☐ reduction of Claimant's benefits.
5.	On May 11, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the ⊠ denial of Claimant's MA application. ⊠ closure of Claimant's FAP case. □ reduction of Claimant's benefits.
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
	epartment policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges gibility Manual (BEM) and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).
Re 42 Ag 31	The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal esponsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence gency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1997 AACS R 400.3101-31. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective ctober 1, 1996.
pro im Re Ag	The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) ogram] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is plemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal egulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence gency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1997 AACS R 0.3001-3015
Se Th	The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social ecurity Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the Aprogram pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., 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.
an 19	The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE d XX of the Social Security Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 90, 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.

Additionally, the evidence shows that Claimant failed to submit proper requested verification. While Claimant had previously submitted verifications for a checking account, Claimant failed to submit verifications for a savings account that was requested. While Claimant testified that she had returned documents, the evidence in the case, including Claimant's testimony, indicates that the evidence returned was prior to the verification request, and not the verifications that the Department required. Furthermore, as the programs in question have asset tests, the verifications in question were required, as per BAM 130.

Therefore, as the verifications in question were required, and as the evidence shows that Claimant failed to return those verifications, the Department's action in closing Claimant's FAP case and denying Claimant's MA application was proper.

Based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusion stated on the record, the Administrative Law Judge conc properly improperly	
	
DECISION AND ORDER	<u>R</u>
The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above F of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, finds t \boxtimes did act properly \square did not act properly.	•
Accordingly, the Department's decision is X AFFII reasons stated on the record.	RMED REVERSED for the
	Robert J. Chavez Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: July 12, 2012

Date Mailed: July 12, 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

