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

IN	TI	4F	MΔ	T	ΓFR	0	F٠

	Reg. No.: Issue Nos.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	2012-75214 2006, 3008, 4003 December 11, 2012 Wayne (82-31)						
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Robert J. Chavez								
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 December 11, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Partment 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:								
		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:								
1. Claimant ⊠ applied for ☐ was receiving: ☐FI	P ⊠FAP ⊠MA [⊠SDA □CDC.						
Claimant was required to submit requested paperwork by July 31, 2012.	ed verification a	and redetermination						

 3. On August 20, 2012, the Department ☐ denied Claimant's application. ☐ closed Claimant's case. ☐ reduced Claimant's benefits . 	
 4. On August 20, 2012, the Department sent notice of the denial of Claimant's application. Closure of Claimant's case. reduction of Claimant's benefits. 	
 5. On September 5, 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	
Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridg Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).	es
☐ The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Person Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-142 USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1997 AACS R 400.31 3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effect October 1, 1996.	93, nce 01-
∑ The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp (program] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and implemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1997 AACS 400.3001-3015	l is eral nce
∑ The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the So Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CF The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MCL 400.105.	R).
∑ The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program which provides financial assistation disabled persons is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to M 400.10, et seq., and 1998-2000 AACS R 400.3151-400.3180.	wn
☐ The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, and XX of the Social Security Act, the Child Care and Development Block Gran	

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 redetermination paperwork.

Claimant testified that he had attempted to return the documents in question on July 23, 2012, and had attempted to attend the interview at that time. Claimant also testified that he signed a logbook that day. However, a review of the logbooks in question does not show Claimant's name. Claimant, thus, has failed to prove his allegation.

Therefore, as there is no evidence that Claimant failed to receive the documentation, and as Claimant admits that the documentation was sent and received, and given that there is no evidence that the documentation was 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 \infty \text{did act properly} \text{did not act properly}.
Accordingly, the Department's decision is \boxtimes AFFIRMED \square REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.
W/ has

Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Robert J. Chavez

Date Signed: January 7, 2013

Date Mailed: January 7, 2013

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

