

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2013-45351  
Issue No.: 3008  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: June 6, 2013  
County: DHS-SSPC-WEST

**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 Claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on June 6, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED].

**ISSUE**

Did the Department properly  deny Claimant's application  close Claimant's case for:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP)?        | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)?    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA)? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA)?                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC)?  |

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. On December 18, 2012, the Claimant applied for FAP benefits.
2. On December 31, 2012, the Department sent the Claimant an appointment notice for a phone interview on January 11, 2013 at 3:00 pm.
3. On January 11, 2013 at 3:00 pm, the Department attempted to call the Claimant for the phone interview. The Department was unable to reach the Claimant.
4. On January 11, 2013, the Department sent the Claimant a notice of missed interview. The notice indicated that the Claimant had missed her January 11, 2013

interview and that it was now the Claimant's responsibility to reschedule the missed interview prior to January 17, 2013.

5. On January 17, 2013, the Department sent the Claimant a notice of case action. The notice indicated the Claimant's FAP benefits were closing for failure to complete the interview process.
6. Due to Department error, the Department continued to issue FAP benefits to the Claimant.
7. On or around April 22, 2013, the Department discovered the error and sent the Claimant a second notice of case action indicating the Claimant's FAP benefits were closing.
8. On April 29, 2013, the Claimant requested a hearing to protest the FAP closure.

### **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 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, *et seq.*, and 1999 AC, R 400.3001 through Rule 400.3015.

Interviews are required to explain program requirements and to gather information to determine eligibility. The Department is allowed to deny applications after the 30<sup>th</sup> day from application if the Claimant has not participated in an interview. BAM 115.

In this case, the Department mailed the Claimant both an interview notice and notice of missed interview. The notices were timely sent to the Claimant's last known address on record.

Because the Claimant alleges to have not received the notices, this issue concerns the application of "the mailbox rule."

Under the mailbox rule "a letter mailed in the due course of business is received." *Good v Detroit Automobile Inter-Insurance Exchange*, 67 Mich App 270 (1976). Such evidence is admissible without further evidence from the records custodian that a particular letter was actually mailed. *Good supra* at 275. "Moreover, the fact that a letter was mailed with a return address but was not returned lends strength to the presumption that the letter was received." *Id* at 276. The challenging party may rebut the presumption that the letter was received by presenting evidence to the contrary. See *id*.

The Department has produced sufficient evidence of its business custom with respect to addressing and mailing of the notices in question. Under the mailbox rule, the mere execution of the DHS forms in the usual course of business rebuttably presumes subsequent receipt by the addressee. *Good v Detroit Automobile Inter-Insurance Exchange*, 67 Mich App 270 (1976). The Department has produced sufficient evidence of its business custom with respect to the mailing of the DHS notices allowing it to rely on this presumption. Claimant, on the other hand, argues that she did not receive some or all of the notices. Despite making this argument, Claimant has not come forward with sufficient evidence to rebut the presumption.

Therefore, based on material, competent and substantial evidence, I find the Department properly closed the Claimant's FAP case as the Claimant failed to participate in the required interview process.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

I find, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, the Department did act properly in this matter.

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



---

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

Date Signed: June 10, 2013

Date Mailed: June 10, 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 **MAY** 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

CAA/las

cc:

