

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2012-49389  
Issue Nos.: 2006; 3008  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: May 30, 2012  
County: Oakland (63-03)

**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 May 30, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of the 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 Medical Assistance (MA) application and close Claimant's Food Assistance Program (FAP) case?

**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 MA and was receiving FAP benefits.
2. Claimant was requested to submit verification for his FAP case by April 13, 2012.
3. On May 1, 2012, the Department denied Claimant's MA application and closed Claimant's FAP case.
4. On April 14, 2012, the Department sent notice of the MA denial and the FAP closure.
5. On May 1, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the denial of his MA application and the closure of his FAP case.

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

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program which provides financial assistance for disabled persons is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department (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 AACS R 400.5001-5015.

With regard to the FAP program, the Department testified that a consolidated inquiry had been run that showed Claimant had income; the Department requested Claimant to return verification of this income. Claimant's FAP case was not up for redetermination. However, the Department failed to present evidence that Claimant had income that needed to be verified. The Department did not provide evidence of a consolidated inquiry or any other documentation that showed Claimant had income. By not providing evidence that Claimant had income, the Department has failed to meet its burden of proof in showing that verification was needed outside of a timely redetermination.

Therefore, as the Department has failed to meet its burden of proof in showing that verification was required, the Department erred when closing claimant's FAP case.

With regard to claimant's MA application, policy in BAM 815 requires a set process to be followed when processing an MA application in which the claimant alleges disability. The Department admitted at hearing that Claimant had not been provided with the forms and documents necessary to process a disability-based MA application. Claimant's application was allegedly denied for failing to provide medical evidence; however, BAM 815 does not require claimant to return such documents. Therefore, as claimant's MA application was processed incorrectly and denied before the Department followed the process outlined for such applications, the Department was incorrect to deny the application in question.

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 improperly denied Claimant's MA application closed Claimant's FAP case.

**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 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:

1. Remove the negative action on claimant's FAP case and reinstate benefits retroactive to the date of negative action;
2. Reprocess the MA application in question retroactive to the date of application.



---

**Robert J. Chavez**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: June 12, 2012

Date Mailed: June 12, 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

RJC/pf

cc:

