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

INI	ти	_ ^ ^	TTE	R OF:
114				K UF

	Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	20126787 3008 December 14, 2011 Wayne DHS (76)			
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Christian Gardocki					
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 , from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the above named Claimant. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included , Manager, and Specialist.					
ISSUE					
Due to a failure to comply with the verification requirements, did the Department properly $\boxtimes$ deny Claimant's application $\square$ close Claimant's case $\square$ reduce Claimant's benefits for:					
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)? ☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)? ☐ Medical Assistance (MA)?		ssistance (SDA)? nt and Care (CDC)?			
FINDINGS OF FACT					
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 □ was receiving: □	FIP ⊠FAP □MA [	□SDA □CDC.			
2. Claimant ⊠ was ☐ was not provided with a Verification Checklist (DHS-3503).					
3. Claimant was required to submit requested ve	erification by 9/19/1	1 (See Exhibit 1).			

4.	On 9/19/11, the Department  denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's case reduced Claimant's benefits for failure to submit verification in a timely manner.
5.	On 9/19/11, the Department sent notice of the   ☐ denial of Claimant's application. ☐ closure of Claimant's case. ☐ reduction of Claimant's benefits.
6.	On 10/17/11, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the ightharpoonup denial. ightharpoonup claim is denial. ightharpoonup claim ightharpoonup claim.
	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 thr	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 1999 AC, Rule 400.3101 rough Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program ective October 1, 1996.
pro im <sub> </sub> 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 1999 AC, Rule 0.3001 through Rule 400.3015.
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, 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 2000 AACS, Rule 400.3151 through Rule 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 1999 AC, Rule 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.

Claimant stated she requested a hearing for various problems with FAP and Medical Assistance (MA) benefits going back as far as 2009. Claimant testified that she submitted a Request for Hearing because she put in multiple applications without receiving any FAP or MA benefits. Claimant agreed that DHS subsequently processed FAP benefits effective 9/22/11 and MA benefits for all of Claimant's household members, though Claimant contended that she is entitled to better MA coverage than what DHS approved.

Based on Claimant's Request for a Hearing (which did not relate to a specific DHS case action) and her testimony, the only issue in dispute related to Claimant's Request for a Hearing was whether DHS properly denied an application dated 8/22/11 requesting FAP benefits. A second issue was whether DHS failed to process MA benefits for Claimant stemming from the same application.

Claimant stated that she applied online for MA benefits on 8/22/11 and that DHS failed to process her request. DHS responded that Claimant's application failed to request MA benefits. The application was presented to Claimant for examination. After examination, Claimant did not dispute DHS' testimony. It is found that DHS properly did not process an 8/22/11 application for MA benefits because Claimant did not apply for MA benefits.

Claimant also disputed the denial of the application dated 8/22/11 requesting FAP benefits. DHS presented a VCL dated 9/9/11 giving Claimant until 9/19/11 to submit various verifications including identity.

A request for program benefits begins with the filing of a DHS-1171 or other acceptable form. BAM 110 at 1. Before processing an application, DHS may require a client to verify information within their application. Verification is usually required at application. BAM 130 at 1. DHS must give clients at least ten days to submit verifications. *Id.* Verification means documentation or other evidence to establish the accuracy of the client's verbal or written statements. *Id.* DHS must tell the client what verification is required, how to obtain it, and the due date. *Id.* at 2. DHS is to use the DHS-3503, Verification Checklist to request verification. *Id.* at 3. Identity must be verified. BEM 221 at 1.

Claimant questioned whether the 8/22/11 application was properly denied for failing to provide verifications. DHS stated that Claimant submitted verifications on 9/22/11, after the VCL due date and after DHS denied Claimant's application dated 8/22/11. Claimant responded that she twice submitted needed verifications to DHS in 8/2011. Claimant also testified that she signed her name to a log which would verify that she made the submissions.

DHS obtained the drop box log, went through the log from 8/22/11-9/22/11 and found no record of Claimant's signature within the log. Claimant was allowed to examine the log but she also did not find any record of her signature. Based on the evidence, Claimant did not submit the requested DHS documents to DHS prior to 9/22/11.

For FAP benefits, DHS is to send a negative action notice when the client indicates a refusal to provide a verification, or the time period given has elapsed and the client has not made a reasonable effort to provide it. BAM 130 at 5. DHS established that Claimant failed to timely provide required verifications. It is found that DHS properly denied Claimant's application dated 8/22/11.

Claimant also disputed whether she received FAP benefits for 9/2011 but DHS verified that Claimant received \$61 in FAP benefits for the period of 9/22/11-9/30/11 by presenting a Benefit Summary Inquiry (Exhibit 3).

presenting a Benefit Summary Inquiry (Exhibit 3).	,
Based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusion stated on the record, the Administrative Law Judge conc properly improperly	
<ul><li>☐ closed Claimant's case.</li><li>☐ denied Claimant's application.</li><li>☐ reduced Claimant's benefits.</li></ul>	
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 \times did act properly.	
Accordingly, the Department's decision is $oxed{oxed}$ AFFII reasons stated on the record.	RMED  REVERSED for the
	Christin Gordock
	Christian Gardocki Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: <u>12/28/11</u>

Date Mailed: 12/28/11

<u>NOTICE</u>: 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 receipt 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

## CG/hw

