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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2013-21067 Issue No.: 3002, 3003

Case No.: Hearing Date:

February 7, 2013

County: Macomb-20 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 Claim ant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on February 7, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included

ISSUE

Did the Department properly close the Claimant's F ood Assistance Program (FAP) benefits beginning January 1, 2013?

FINDINGS OF FACT

I find, bas ed upon t he compet ent, material, and substantial evi dence on the whole record, including testimony of witnesses, finds as material fact:

- As of December 2012, the Claimant was receiving FAP benefits.
- 2. At some point prior to January 1, 2013, the Claimant received from the Department and returned to the Department a redetermination form.
- On approximately J anuary 1, 2013, the Department logged the Claimant's redetermination information untimely result ing in the closure of the Claimant's FAP case.
- 4. On approximately January 2, 2013, the Department notified the Claimant of the FAP closure.
- 5. On Januar y 7, 2013, the Claimant filed a hearing r equest, protesting the FAP closure.

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 (F S) program] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in T itle 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CF R). 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.

Clients have the right to c ontest a department decis ion affecting eligibility or benefit levels whenever it is believed that the decision is incorrect. The department will provide an administrative hearing to rev iew the decision and determine the appropriateness of that decision. (BAM 600).

Testimony and other evidence must be we ighed and considered according to its reasonableness. Moreover, the weight and credibility of this evidence is generally for the fact-finder to determine. In evaluating the credibility and weight to be given the testimony of a witness, the fact-finder may consider the demeanor of the witness, the reasonableness of the witness is testimony, and the interest, if any, the witness may have in the outcome of the matter.

I have carefully considered and weighed the testimony and other evidence in the record and find the Department closed the Claimant's case due to the Department not logg ing the Claimant's review information timely. As to why the Depart ment did not log the information timely, I do not know. It could be the Claimant returned the redetermination information untimely, or it could be the Department simply dropped the ball and failed to log the information in a timely manner. The evidence in this case was seriously lack ing on this issue as the Department failed to provide the redetermination paperwork itself and the Department witness could not ident ify when the Department sent the redetermination paperwork to the Claimant returned the redetermination paperwork to the Department. For this reason, I am reversing the Department's actions in this matter.

DECISION AND ORDER

I find, bas ed upon the above Findings of Fa ct and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, find the Department did not act properly in this matter.

Accordingly, the Department's decision is **REVERSED**.

¹ Gardiner v Courtright, 165 Mich 54, 62; 130 NW 322 (1911); Dep't of Community Health v Risch, 274 Mich App 365, 372; 733 NW2d 403 (2007).

² Dep't of Community Health, 274 Mich App at 372; People v Terry, 224 Mich App 447, 452; 569 NW2d 641 (1997).

³ People v Wade, 303 Mich 303 (1942), cert den, 318 US 783 (1943).

The Department is ordered to:

 Initiate a redetermination as to t he Claimant's eligibi lity for FAP benefits beginning January 1, 2013 and issue retroac tive benefits if otherwise eligible and qualified.

<u>/s/</u>

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

Date Signed: February 8, 2013

Date Mailed: February 8, 2013

NOTICE: Michigan Administrative Hearing Syst em (MAHS) may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a par ty within 30 days of the receipt date of this Dec ision and Orde r. MAHS will not or der a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's mo tion where the final decis ion 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, math ematical error, or other obvious errors in the he aring 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

consideration/Rehearing Request

P. O. Box 30639

Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

CAA/las

CC:

