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

11	LTI		BA A	•	ΓFR	\sim	г.
ır	4 I I	7E	IVI	۱ı	ırk	u	-

		Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	2012-57934 2006 September 20, 2012 Wayne (82-76)				
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: R	obert J. Chav	ez					
<u>HE</u>	ARING 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 September 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 properly deny Claimant's applicate benefits for:							
Family Independence Program (I Food Assistance Program (FAP) Medical Assistance (MA)?			ssistance (SDA)? nt and Care (CDC)?				
FINDINGS OF FACT							
The Administrative Law Judge, bas evidence on the whole record, include							
1. Claimant ☐ applied for ☒ was re	eceiving: FI	P □FAP ⊠MA [□SDA □CDC.				
2. Claimant was required to sul paperwork by May 31, 2012.	omit requeste	ed verification a	nd redetermination				

3.	On June 1, 2012, the Department denied Claimant's application. closed Claimant's case. reduced Claimant's benefits.
4.	On April 27, 2012, the Department sent notice of the denial of Claimant's application. Closure of Claimant's case. reduction of Claimant's benefits.
5.	On June 6, 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
	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 lency) 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 lency) 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 curity Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). e Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the A 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.
	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

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.

Additionally, the evidence shows that Claimant failed to submit proper requested verification and redetermination paperwork for her children's case. Claimant was sent a redetermination form on April 16, 2012. Claimant, by her testimony, stated that she did receive the paperwork in question. Furthermore, Claimant admits to not returning the redetermination packet.

Claimant's case was also closed because she had failed to meet her spenddown for the three months prior to the closure date of the case. BAM 210 provides that if a spendown is not met for three months, the MA case is to be placed into closure.

Therefore, as there is no evidence that Claimant failed to receive the documentation, and as Caimant admits that the documentation was sent and received, and that the documentation was not returned, the undersigned holds that the case was closed properly. As such, the Department was correct when it closed the 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 \square properly \square 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 did act properly did not act properly.
Accordingly, the Department's decision is \boxtimes AFFIRMED \square REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.
W/ Jun

Robert J. Chavez
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: October 17, 2012

Date Mailed: October 17, 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.

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

