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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2013-10087

Issue No.: Case No.:

5022

Hearing Date: County:

April 29, 2013 Wayne (82-76)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Jonathan W. Owens

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, an inperson hearing was held on April 29, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant and Department of Human Services (Department) failed to appear for the 1 p.m. hearing. As a result, the hearing proceeded without the Department at 1:38 p.m.

ISSUE

Whether the Department properly denied the Claimant's request for State Emergency Relief (SER)?

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 State Emergency Relief (SER) in November 2012.
2.	On November 7, 2012, the Department I denied Claimant's application I closed Claimant's case due to the Detroit Edison (DTE) account not being in his name.
3.	On November 7, 2012, the Department sent Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the denial. closure.
4.	On November 8, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the denial of the application.

 \boxtimes did act properly.

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 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, Rule 400.7001 through Rule 400.7049. Department policies are found in the State Emergency Relief Manual (ERM).

In the instant case, Claimant applied for SER assistance for a shut off for the residence . At the time of application, the bill outstanding was on an account in Claimant's ex-wife's name. The bill was not in his name. The property in question was also not in Claimant's name. Claimant had not been living at the residence during the time period to which the bill in question pertained. Claimant returned to Michigan after his ex-wife had passed away. The Department indicated the denial of the SER benefits was based upon the bill in question not being in Claimant's name. In addition the Department noted on the hearing summary the SER requested would not resolve the emergency. Department failed to appear for the hearing timely even after repeated attempts to locate a person to represent. Therefore, the only evidence consisted of the hearing summary completed by the Department on November 9, 2012, and the account statement dated November 9, 2012. ERM 301 (October 2012), p. 4, regarding energy services requires the name on the energy account bill must match the head of household name or the head of household's spouse's name. It is not sufficient to be in the name of a living-together partner. The spouse must be active on the head of household's case. As indicated above, the bill submitted by Claimant was not in Claimant's name nor his "spouse's" name since Claimant was divorced. 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 denied Claimant's application improperly denied Claimant's application properly closed Claimant's case improperly closed Claimant's case for: \square AMP \square FIP \square FAP \square MA \boxtimes SER \square 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 not act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's \square AMP \square FIP \square FAP \square MA \boxtimes SER \square CDC decision is \boxtimes AFFIRMED \square REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.

Jonathan W. Owens
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: May 6, 2013

Date Mailed: May 6, 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. (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 <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 affect the substantial rights of the claimant:
 - 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

JWO/pf

cc: