

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 201236969
Issue No.: 2006, 3008
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: April 4, 2012
County: Ingham County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Corey A. Arendt

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 April 4, 2012, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED].

ISSUE

Due to a failure to comply with the verification requirements, did the Department properly deny Claimant's application close Claimant's case reduce Claimant's benefits for:

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

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: FIP FAP MA SDA CDC.
2. On February 2, 2012, the Claimant was was not provided with a verification checklist (DHS-3503).
3. Claimant was required to submit requested verification by February 13, 2012.

4. On March 1, 2012, 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 February 17, 2012, the Department sent notice of the
 denial of Claimant's application.
 closure of Claimant's case.
 reduction of Claimant's benefits.
6. On March 1, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the
 denial. closure. reduction.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

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

The 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 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 (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105.

Based on the undisputed facts, I find the Claimant received adequate notice regarding the verification checklists and at no time requested additional time or attempted to notify the Department of a problem acquiring the requested verifications. The Claimant verified receipt of the checklist, but could not provide any proof she returned the requested information.

Furthermore, based on the testimony presented, I found the Department witnesses to be more credible than the Claimant. The Department witnesses had a clearer grasp of the dates, times and events in question. Furthermore, the Claimant identified several documents she alleged to have received, but could not provide them when requested.

Therefore, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, I find the Department properly closed Claimant's MA and FAP benefits.

DECISION AND ORDER

I find, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, find that the Department did act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's decision is **AFFIRMED** for the reasons stated on the record.

/s/ _____
Corey A. Arendt
Administrative Law Judge
For Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: April 5, 2012

Date Mailed: April 5, 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 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 **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.

201236969/CAA

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

CAA/cr

cc:

