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

IN THE MATTER OF:

		Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	201325226 2006, 3008 February 20, 2013 Eaton County DHS	
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Suzanne Morris				
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 February 20, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included				
<u>ISSUE</u>				
Due to a failure to comply with the verification requirements, did the Department properly \boxtimes deny Claimant's application \square close Claimant's case \square reduce Claimant's benefits for:				
\times			ssistance (SDA)? nt and Care (CDC)?	
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: ☐FI	P ⊠FAP ⊠MA [□SDA □CDC.	
2.	Claimant ⊠ was ☐ was not provided with a September 12, 2012, indicating that she needs verifications by September 21, 2012.			
3.	Claimant was required to submit requested veri	fication by Septer	nber 21, 2012.	

4.	On September 25, 2012, the Department denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's case reduced Claimant's benefits for failure to submit verification in a timely manner.		
5.	On September 25, 2012, the Department did not re-activate the claimant's application.		
6.	On January 17, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the denial. closure. reduction.		
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW		
	partment policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges gibility Manual (BEM) and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).		
Re 42 Ag thre	The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal sponsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence ency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, R 400.3101 ough Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program ective 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, <i>et seq.</i> , and 1999 AC, R 400.3001 through Rule 400.3015.			
Se Th	The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social curity Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). e Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the 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 2000 AACS, R 400.3151 through Rule 400.3180.		
and 199	The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE d XX of the Social Security Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 90, and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. e 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.

Additionally, the claimant admitted at hearing that she had received the Self-Employment Income and Expense Statements (DHS-431) that the department had requested she return by September 21, 2012. The claimant testified that she faxed in some information (although not the DHS-431s) on September 11 or 12, 2012. However, the correspondence log provided by the department shows the last correspondence received by the department from the client was on August 10, 2012. Further, the claimant admitted that she did not return the required completed forms (DHS-431s) to the department. Thus, the department properly denied her application as they did not have the required information.

ased upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons ated 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
he Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, finds that the Department did not act properly.
ccordingly, the Department's decision is $igtimes$ AFFIRMED $igcap$ REVERSED for the easons stated on the record.
<u>/s/</u>
Suzanne Morris
Administrative Law Judge
For Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services
ate Signed: February 22, 2013

Date Mailed: February 22, 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 <u>MAY</u> be granted if there is newly discovered evidence that could affect the outcome of the original hearing decision.
- A reconsideration <u>MAY</u> 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

SM/cr

CC:

