

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**



Reg. No.: 201265485  
Issue No.: 2006  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: September 5, 2012  
County: Ottawa County DHS

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Christopher S. Saunders

**HEARING DECISION**

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 5, 2012, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED] Claimant's guardian and authorized representative. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED].

**ISSUE**

Did the Department properly  deny Claimant's application  close Claimant's case for:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP)?  | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)?    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP)?      | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA)? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC)?  |

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. Claimant  applied for benefits  received benefits for:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP).  | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP).    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP).      | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA). |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA). | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC).  |

2. On April 1, 2012, the Department  
 denied Claimant's application       closed Claimant's case  
due to failure to return the requested verifications.
3. On May 15, 2012, the Department sent  
 Claimant       Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)  
notice of the       denial.       closure.
4. On June 28, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the  
 denial of the application.       closure of the case.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

Department policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 42 USC 601, *et seq.* The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 1999 AC, R 400.3101 through Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996.

The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) program] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 1999 AC, R 400.3001 through Rule 400.3015.

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105.

The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is administered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 2000 AAC, R 400.3151 through Rule 400.3180.

The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE and 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 1999 AC, R 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.

Additionally, at the hearing the department produced the verification checklist that was sent to the Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) on April 11, 2012 with a due date of April 23, 2012 (see Department Exhibit 3). Said checklist requested additional information pertaining to the Claimant's checking account. The checklist was not specific as to what documentation was required. On April 19, 2012, the Claimant's AR submitted a bank statement from 2011 as the bank account was no longer active. The department did not accept this statement as verification because it was more than 30 days old. However, the department did not specify in its original request that the verification had to be less than 30 days old, nor was the Claimant's AR contacted via phone call or subsequent verification checklist to inform him that the verifications submitted were not sufficient. The Claimant's AR submitted the best information available to him at the time based on the request of the department. Accordingly, the Administrative Law Judge finds that the Claimant did substantially comply with the verification request of the department. Therefore, the department did not properly deny the Claimant's application.

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 denied Claimant's application     improperly denied Claimant's application  
 properly closed Claimant's case             improperly closed Claimant's case

for:    AMP    FIP    FAP    MA    SDA    CDC.

**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  AMP    FIP    FAP    MA    SDA    CDC decision is  AFFIRMED    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:

Initiate a redetermination of the Claimant's eligibility for MA benefits based on the Claimant's April 10, 2012 application. Allow the Claimant to submit any additional information that may be needed to process the application. If the Claimant is found to

be otherwise eligible, the department shall issue benefits in accordance with policy and, if applicable, issue any past due benefits that may be due and owing that the Claimant is otherwise eligible to receive.

/s/  
Christopher S. Saunders  
Administrative Law Judge  
For Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: September 5, 2012

Date Mailed: September 7, 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 **MAY** 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

CSS/cr

cc:

