

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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2012-9236
Issue No.: 3008
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: February 1, 2012
County: Ingham

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: C. Adam Purnell

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 February 1, 2012, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED] (Assistance Payments Supervisor) and [REDACTED] (Eligibility Specialist).

ISSUE

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

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

2. On October 1, 2011, the Department
 denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's case
due to failure to return a redetermination packet.
3. On September 19, 2011, the Department sent
 Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)
notice of the denial. closure.
4. On October 5, 2011, 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 1997 AACS R 400.3101-3131. 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 1997 AACS R 400.3001-3015.

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 1998-2000 AACS R 400.3151-400.3180.

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 1997 AACRS R 400.5001-5015.

Additionally, policy requires that clients must cooperate with the local office in determining initial and ongoing eligibility. BAM 105. Clients must report changes in circumstance that potentially affect eligibility or benefit amount. BAM 105. Changes must be reported within 10 days of receiving the first payment reflecting the change. BAM 105. For purposes of AMP, verifications are due the same date as the redetermination/review interview. BAM 210. When an interview is not required, verifications are due the date the packet is due. BAM 210. Bridges allows clients a full 10 calendar days from the date the verification is requested (date of request is not counted) to provide all documents and information. BAM 210. If the 10th day falls on a weekend or holiday, the verification would not be due until the next business day. BAM 210.

Here, Claimant asserts that she did not receive the redetermination packet in the mail. This Administrative Law Judge finds that the Department mailed Claimant's redetermination packet on August 16, 2011 and the packet was due on September 1, 2011. Claimant relocated on August 17, 2011 but did not report that she had a new mailing address within 10 days of the change (she reported on August 29, 2011). It has long been established that "a letter mailed in the due course of business is received." *Good v Detroit Automobile Inter-Insurance Exchange*, 67 Mich App 270 (1976). Such evidence is admissible without further evidence from the records custodian that a particular letter was actually mailed. *Good supra* at 275. "Moreover, the fact that a letter was mailed with a return address but was not returned lends strength to the presumption that the letter was received." *Id* at 276. The challenging party may rebut the presumption that the letter was received by presenting evidence to the contrary. See *id*.

The department has produced sufficient evidence of its business custom with respect to addressing and mailing, the mere execution of the letter in the usual course of business rebuttably presumes subsequent receipt by the addressee. *Good v Detroit Automobile Inter-Insurance Exchange*, 67 Mich App 270 (1976). The department has produced sufficient evidence of its business custom with respect to the mailing of redetermination packet notices, allowing it to rely on this presumption. Moreover, Claimant has not come forward with sufficient evidence to rebut the presumption.

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

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> properly denied Claimant's application | <input type="checkbox"/> improperly denied Claimant's application |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> properly closed Claimant's case | <input type="checkbox"/> 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:

/s/

C. Adam Purnell
Administrative Law Judge
For Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 2/6/12

Date Mailed: 2/6/12

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 mailing 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.

CAP/ds

■ [REDACTED]