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

ı	N	П	П			٨	A I	۷.	г	ΓΕ	Р)			•
	IV			п	_	- 11	117	•					_	•	_

	Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	2012-5505 2006 March 28, 2012 Macomb (12)				
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Michael J.	Bennane					
HEARING DI	ECISION					
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 March 28, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the claimant and Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included						
<u>ISSU</u>	<u>E</u>					
Due to a failure to comply with the ve rific properly ⊠ deny Claimant's application ☐ clobenefits for:	ation requirements, one Claimant's case [
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)? ☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)? ☐ Medical Assistance (MA)?		ssistance (SDA)? ent and Care (CDC)?				
FINDINGS C	OF FACT					
The Administrative Law Judge, based upon evidence on the whole record, including testim	•	•				
1. Cla imant ⊠ applied for ☐ was receiving:	□FIP □FAP ⊠MA	□SDA □CDC				
 Claimant was required to submit requeste 2011, August 8, 2011 and August 18, 2011 		18, 2011, July 28,				
 On September 6, 2011, the Department ☐ denied Claimant's application 						

2012-5505/MJB

	☐ closed Claimant's case ☐ reduced Claimant's benefits
4.	On September 7, 2011, the Department sent notice of the ☐ denial of Claimant's application. ☐ closure of Claimant's case. ☐ reduction of Claimant's benefits.
5.	On September 23, 2011, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the ⊠ denial. ☐ closure. ☐ reduction of Claimant's FAP 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 W ork Opportunity Reconc iliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly k nown as the Family Independence lency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1997 AACS R 400.3101-31. FI P replac ed the Aid to Depe ndent Children (ADC) program effective stober 1, 1996.
pro im Re Ag	The Food Assistanc e Program (FAP) [fo rmerly known as the Food Sta mp (FS) ogram] is establis hed by the Food St amp Act of 1977, as amend ed, 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 ency) administers FAP pur suant to MCL 400. 10, et seq., and 1997 AACS R 0.3001-3015
Se Th	The Medical Ass istance (MA) program is es tablished by the Title XIX of the Soc ial curity Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). e Department (formerly known as the F amily Independence Agency) administers the A program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MCL 400.105.
for as	The State Disability Assistance (SDA) progr am which provides financial as sistance disabled persons is established by 2004 PA 344. The Depart ment (formerly known the F amily Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to M CL 0.10, et seq., and 1998-2000 AACS R 400.3151-400.3180.
an 19 Th an	The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE d XX of the Soc ial Security Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 90, and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. e program is implemented by Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 98 d 99. The Department provides services to adult and children pursuant to MCL 0.14(1) and 1997 AACS R 400.5001-5015.

Additionally, the Department stated that the claimant wis hed to withdraw her hearing request. When questioned, the claimant stated that she wis hed to add other issues to the request for hearing. This Administrative Law Judge a sked the claimant if she had medical bills since her June 23, 2011, MA application and the claimant responded in the affirmative.

This Administrative Law Judge then informed the claimant and her representative that if that was done, her ability to have a hearing on the issue she originally wis hed to have decided, or to have the medical expenses—since June 23, 2011, reviewed f or payment would no longer be available t—o her, due to—the ni—nety day limit, under which the claimant must request a hearing within ninety days of the negative action. "MAHS will not accept a withdrawal if it—fails to adequat ely address and dispose of all c—oncerns in the hearing request. MAHS will—notify the hearings coordinat—or, client and AHR if a withdrawal is not ac—cepted." (BAM 600, p. 21). This—Administrative Law Judge determined that a hearing should proceed.

The documentation provided in the claim ant's file s howed that she had attempted to fulfill the Department's request for verifi cation but was only able to provide the Department with documentation of the cash value of a \$25,000.00 whole life insuranc e policy which showed a "cash surr ender value" of \$225.36. The is is clearly shown in a CUNA Mutual Group "Summary of Values" as of March 20, 2011.

This Administrative Law Ju dge finds that the Department failed to use the best information available as required in BAM 130:

"The client must obtain required verification, but y ou must assist if they need and request help.

If neither the client nor you can obtain verification despite a reasonable effort, use the best available information. If no evidence is available, use your best judgment." (BAM 130, p.3).

In the inst ant case, the D epartment had the summary of va lues from the ins urance company that had been prepared on Marc h 22, 2011. The Department stated that it needed the cash value of said policy for t he month of applic ation. The information provided was clearly the best information available and very current information.

Based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasonstated 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 of Law, and for the reas ☐ did act properly	ons stated on the rec	ord, finds that the	s of Fact and Conclusions Department
Accordingly, the Depar reasons stated on the re		AFFIRMED	⊠ REVERSED for the
☐ THE DEPARTMENT			ING WITHIN 10 DAYS OF

1. Reregister and proces s the claimant's June 23, 2011, MA application, utilizing the cash value of \$225.36 for the cash value of the insu rance polic y at the time of application. In addition, if the claimant is found to have qualified for MA back to June 23, 2011, the Department will replace any lost benefits back to the date of application.

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

Date Signed: April 10, 2012

Date Mailed: April 10, 2012

NOTICE:

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

2012-5505/MJB

