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 48766 1005,3008,2006 June 20, 2013 Wayne (76)	
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Lynn M. Ferris			
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 20, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included FIS.			
<u>ISSUE</u>			
Due to a failure to comply with the verification requirements, did the Department properly \square deny Claimant's application \boxtimes close Claimant's case \square reduce Claimant's benefits for:			
		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:			
 Claimant ⊠ applied for FIP cash assistance a	ınd 🗵 was recei	ving: ⊠FAP ⊠MA	

- 2. Claimant was required to submit requested verification by May 1, 2013 (redetermination) and a New Hire Notice which was due to be returned December 17, 2012. Exhibit 3 and Exhibit 4.
- The Claimant did not return the New Hire Notice regarding her boyfriend who
 resided in her household at the time the Notice was requested. The Claimant did
 not advise the Department that her boyfriend had left until after the Notice of New
 Hire was due.
- 4. The Department closed the Claimant's Medical Assistance effective June 1, 2013 due to failure to return the redetermination.

5.	On February 16, 2013, the Department denied Claimant's application for cash assistance. closed Claimant's case. reduced Claimant's benefits.
6.	On June 1, 2013, the Department denied Claimant's application. closed Claimant's case for Medical Assistance. reduced Claimant's benefits.
7.	On April 1, 2013, the Department denied Claimant's application. closed Claimant's case for Food Assistance. reduced Claimant's benefits.
8.	On March 7, 2013, the Department sent notice of the ☐ denial of Claimant's application. ☐ closure of Claimant's case. ☐ reduction of Claimant's benefits.
9.	On May 21, 2013, 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

Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

☑ The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 42 USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence

Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1997 AACS R 400.3101-3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective 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, et seq., and 1997 AACS R 400.3001-3015		
☑ The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social Security 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 MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, <i>et seq.</i> , and MCL 400.105.		
Additionally, the Claimant's FAP case and FIP cash assistance application were denied due to failure to return a new hire notice to the Department when due and complete a semi-annual review redetermination. Exhibit 2 The evidence presented at the hearing supported the Department's actions as the Claimant did not provide the requested verifications. Although the Claimant's boyfriend was responsible to complete the New Hire Notice, at the time it was due the Claimant's boyfriend was still residing in the household. Thus, the fact that the Claimant advised the Department that he subsequently moved from the house had no bearing on the fact that the Notice was not responded to in a timely manner. Based upon these facts it is determined that the Department properly closed the Claimant's FAP and MA case due to failure to complete the redetermination and properly denied the FIP application. The Claimant may reapply at any time for her benefits.		
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		
		
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 did act properly did not act properly.		

Accordingly, the Department's decision is \boxtimes 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: June 27, 2013 Date Mailed: June 27, 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 <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 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
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request
P. O. Box 30639
Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

LMF/cl

CC: