#### 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:

2013 36892 3008

April 22, 2013 Wayne County DHS (57)

# ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Lynn M. Ferris

# **HEARING DECISION**

This matter is before the undersigned Administ rative 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 Apr il 22, 2013, from Detroit, Mi chigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant inc luded the Claimant. Pa rticipants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included ES.

#### ISSUE

rification requirements, did the Department Due to a failure to comply with the ve properly  $\prod$  deny Claimant's application  $\bigotimes$  close Claimant's case  $\prod$  reduce Claimant's benefits for:

imes	

Family Independence Program (FIP)? Food Assistance Program (FAP)? Medical Assistance (MA)?

State Disability Assistance (SDA)? Child Development and Care (CDC)?

# FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the competent, material, and substantia evidence on the whole record, including testimony of witnesses, finds as material fact:

- 1. Cla imant applied for was receiving: FIP FAP MA SDA CDC.
- 2. Claimant was required to submit requested verification by February 11, 2013 to verify New Hire information. Exhibit 1
- 3. The Claimant did not submit the requested verification by the due date even though it was received by him in time to provide the information in a timely manner.

- 4. On March 1, 2013, the Department denied Claimant's application.
  - $\boxtimes$  closed Claimant's case.

reduced Claimant's benefits.

5. On February 14, 2013, the Department sent notice of the denial of Claimant's application.

 $\overline{\boxtimes}$  closure of Claimant's case.

reduction of Claimant's benefits.

6. On March 19, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the

denial of Claimant's application.

 $\boxtimes$  closure of Claimant's case.

reduction of Claimant's benefits.

### 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 Progr am (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and W ork Opportunity Reconc iliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 42 USC 601, *et seq*. The Department (formerly k nown as the Family Independence Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq*., and 1997 AACS R 400.3101-3131. FI P replac ed the Aid to Depe ndent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996.

The Food Assistanc e Program (FAP) [for merly 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 1997 AACS R 400.3001-3015

☐ The Medical Ass istance (MA) program is es tablished by the Title XIX of the Soc ial Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the F amily 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 as sistance for disabled persons is established by 2004 PA 344. The Depart ment (formerly known as the F amily Independence Agency) admini sters the SDA program pursuant to M CL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 1998-2000 AACS R 400.3151-400.3180.

☐ The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is establis hed by Titles IVA, IVE and XX of the Soc ial Security Act, the Ch ild Care and Developm ent 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 Feder al Regulations, Parts 98 and 99. T he Department provides servic es to adult s and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and 1997 AACS R 400.5001-5015.

Additionally, in this case the evidence presented by the Claimant through his credible testimony was that he did not submit t he requested v erification by the due and was a week late. Therefore, based upon the evidence it is determined that the Department properly closed the Claimant's FAP case for failure to verify new hire information.

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

 $\boxtimes$  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 Depar tment's decision is  $\square$  AFFIRMED  $\square$  REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.

Lynn M. Ferris` Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: April 29, 2013

Date Mailed: April 29, 2013

**NOTICE**: Michigan Administrative Hearing S ystem (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 mailing date of this Dec ision and Order . MAHS will not order 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 <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 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

Re consideration/Rehearing Request P. O. Box 30639

Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

#### LMF/cl

