

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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2012-77049
Issue No.: 2006
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: January 16, 2013
County: Shiawassee County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Carmen G. Fahie

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 Wednesday, January 16, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the claimant's attorney, [REDACTED], P# 25674. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED], FIM, [REDACTED] ES, and Atty. [REDACTED], P# 67601 from the Attorney General's Office.

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 type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC)? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA)? | <input type="checkbox"/> State Emergency Relief (SER)? |

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 SER.
2. Claimant was was not provided with a Verification Checklist (DHS-3503).

3. Claimant was required to submit requested verification by June 11, 2012.
4. On July 17, 2012, the Department
 - denied Claimant's application
 - closed Claimant's case
 - reduced Claimant's benefitsfor failure to submit verification in a timely manner.
5. On July 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 September 4, 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 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 1999 AC, R 400.3101 through Rule 400.3131. 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 1999 AC, R 400.3001 through Rule 400.3015.

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 2000 AAC, R 400.3151 through Rule 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 1999 AC, R 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.

The State Emergency Relief (SER) program is established by 2004 PA 344. The SER program is administered pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and by, 1999 AC, R 400.7001 through Rule 400.7049. Department policies are found in the State Emergency Relief Manual (ERM).

Additionally, the claimant was admitted to the nursing home on February 10, 2012. The claimant's attorney filed an application on behalf of the claimant on May 16, 2012. On July 17, 2012, the department denied the application because of failure to provide proof of assets to determine MA eligibility.

During the hearing, the claimant's attorney submitted proof of written verifications submitted with the county's date stamp that were not received by the department caseworker making the eligibility determination. In addition, the claimant's attorney submitted a case brief and exhibits with her hearing requests, but the additional information was not submitted as part of the hearing packet. The claimant's attorney had a copy of the brief and exhibits with the county's date stamp on them.

The department has not met their burden that they correctly followed policy because the claimant's attorney on two (2) separate occasions submitted information that was not properly utilized by the department. If the department caseworker had gotten the submitted verifications submitted by the claimant's attorney, then she could have properly determined eligibility and let the claimant's attorney know if any information was missing. On the otherhand, the claimant's attorney also had the responsibility to follow up to make sure that the department caseworker received the information that she submitted so that the application could be processed timely.

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

properly 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

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. Initiate a redetermination of the Claimant's eligibility for MA.
2. Provide the Claimant and the claimant's attorney with written notification of the Department's revised eligibility determination.
3. Issue the Claimant any retroactive benefits she/he may be eligible to receive, if any.

/s/ _____
Carmen G. Fahie
Administrative Law Judge
For Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: January 22, 2013

Date Mailed: January 23, 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 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.

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

CGF/hj

cc:

