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

	TIL	A V .	TTC	\mathbf{n}	~ E.
IN	ΙН	MΑ	TTE	ĸ	JF:

	Reg. No.: Issue Nos.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	2013-250 2006, 4003 December 17, 2012 Wayne (82-55)
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Robert J. Ch	navez	
HEARING DE	CISION	
This matter is before the undersigned Administrand MCL 400.37 following Claimant's requestelephone hearing was held on December Participants on behalf of Claimant included Department of Human Services (Department) in	st for a hearing. r 17, 2012, from . Particip	After due notice, a
ISSUE		
Due to a failure to comply with the verificat properly ⊠ deny Claimant's application ☐ clos benefits for:		
	∑ State Disability A ☐ Child Developme	ssistance (SDA)? ent and Care (CDC)?
FINDINGS OF	FACT	
The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the evidence on the whole record, including testimo		
Claimant ⊠ applied for □ was receiving: □]FIP □FAP ⊠MA	⊠SDA □CDC.
Claimant was required to submit reque paperwork by August 6, 2012.	ested verification a	and redetermination
 On September 10, 2012, the Department		

4.	On September 10, 2012, the Department sent notice of the ☐ denial of Claimant's application. ☐ closure of Claimant's case. ☐ reduction of Claimant's benefits.
5.	On September 20, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the ☐ denial of Claimant's application. ☐ closure of Claimant's case. ☐ reduction of Claimant's benefits.
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
	epartment policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges igibility Manual (BEM) and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).
Re 42 Ag 31	The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal esponsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence gency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1997 AACS R 400.3101-31. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective ctober 1, 1996.
pro im Re Ag	The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) ogram] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is plemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal egulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence gency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1997 AACS R 0.3001-3015
Se Th	The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social ecurity 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 A program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MCL 400.105.
for as	The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program which provides financial assistance disabled persons is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department (formerly known the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 0.10, et seq., and 1998-2000 AACS R 400.3151-400.3180.
an 19 Th an	The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE of XX of the Social Security Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 190, 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 of 99. The Department provides services to adults and children pursuant to MCL 10.14(1) and 1997 AACS R 400.5001-5015.

Additionally, the evidence shows that Claimant did not fail to submit proper requested verification paperwork .

Claimant testified that the paperwork was received. Furthermore, Claimant alleged to have turned in and submitted the paperwork in question by the due date, and signed the DHS drop-box logs as proof.

Claimant requested that the drop-box logs be submitted into the evidence record, and the Department offered no objections to the submission of those logs. The logs, which are in the possession of the Department, were to be faxed in by the Department subsequent to the hearing. As of the date of this writing, no logs were ever faxed, nor was any explanation offered by the Department, nor confirmation of delivery sought.

Thus, as Claimant believes that the evidence in question would prove his claims, and as the evidence in question was in the control of the opposing party, and as the opposing party did not submit the evidence in question, the undersigned will assume that the evidence in question would resolve any lingering questions in favor of Claimant, if presented.

Therefore, as Claimant alleged that the logs would show that the verifications in question were presented in a timely manner and as those logs were not submitted by the Department, the undersigned holds that the logs would show that the verifications in question were submitted timely. As such, the undersigned holds that Claimant submitted all requested verifications timely and that the Department was in error to deny the application in question.

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 \square did act properly \square did not act properly.
Accordingly, the Department's decision is \square AFFIRMED \boxtimes REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.
oxtimes THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO DO THE FOLLOWING WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER:

1. Initiate reprocessing of Claimant's July 13, 2013 MA and SDA application.

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

Date Signed: January 16, 2013

Date Mailed: January 16, 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.

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 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

