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:

2013-49018 2006, 3008

June 26, 2013 Kalamazoo County DHS

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 Claim ant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on J une 26, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant inc luded Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included

### ISSUE

Due to a failure to comply with the ve	rification requirements,	did the Department
properly 🛛 deny Claimant's application	Close Claimant's case	reduce Claimant's
benefits for:		

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

Medical Assistance (MA)?

	State	
	Child State	De
(	State	Er

isability Assistance (SDA)? evelopment and Care (CDC)? tate Emergency Relief (SER)?

# 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. On March 12, 2013, the Claimant applied for SER.
- 2. On or around March 12, 2013, the Department denied the Claimant's SER application.
- 3. On April 29, 2013, the Claimant applied for FAP and MA benefits for both herself and her live-in boyfriend.
- On May 1, 2013, the Department appr oved the Claimant for expedited 4. FAP benefits.

- 5. On or around May 1, 2013, the De partment sent the Claimant a verification checklist requesting ve rifications of the Claimant's and boyfriend's checking and savings accounts. The verifications were due by May 13, 2013.
- 6. As of May 13, 2013, the Claimant returned the requested verifications and a statement indicating the boyfriend did not have any savings or checking accounts.
- 7. On May 14, 2013, the Department denied the Claim ant's FAP and MA application for failing to return verifications of the Claimant's boyfriends savings/checking accounts.
- 8. On May 23, 2013, the Claimant r equested a hearing protesting the SER, FAP and MA denials.

## 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 FAP [formerly known as the Food Stamp (F S) program] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in T itle 7 of t he Code of Federal Regulations (CF R). The Department (formerly known as the Fa mily Independence Agenc y) admin isters FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 1999 AC, R 400.3001 through Rule 400.3015.

The MA program is established by the Titl e XIX of the Social Security Act and is implemented by T itle 42 of t he Code of F ederal Regulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Fa mily Independence Agenc y) admin isters the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105.

Clients have the right to contest a Departm ent decision affecting eligibility or benefit levels whenever it is believed that the decision is incorrect. The Department will provide an administrative hearing to rev iew the decision and determine the appropriateness of that decision. (BAM 600).

Department policy indicates the at clients must cooperate with the loca I office in determining initial and ongoing eligibility with all programs. (BAM 105). This includes completion of the necessary forms. Clie nts who are able to but refuse to provide necessary information or take a required action are subject to penalties. (BAM 105).

The Department did not provide any testim ony or documentati on regarding the SER denial. Additionally, t he documentation and testimony from the Department regarding the FAP and MA denial was al I over the place. The D epartment could not provide a clear and detailed picture of what transpired.

What is clear is that the Department timely provided the Claimant with a verification checklist. What transpired after this was foggy at best. There is no dispute the Claimant turned over all of the requested information minus the non-existent bank records of the boyfriend.

At no point in time did the Department re quest the Claimant to s ubmit documentation regarding the closure of accounts.

Based on the testimony provided, I could not determine why the Department denied the case if there is no record of any bank accounts belonging to the boyfriend.

Accordingly, I am reversing the Department in this matter.

### DECISION AND ORDER

I find based upon the above F indings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, the Department did not act properly.

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

THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO DO THE FOLLOWING WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER:

- 1. Initiate a redetermination of the Claim ant's eligibility for FAP and MA benefits beginning April 29, 2013 and is sue retroactive benefits if otherwise eligible and qualified.
- 2. Initiate a redetermination as to t he Claimant's eligibility for SER ben efits beginning March 12, 2013 and issue retroactive benefits if otherwise eligible and qualified.

fact

Corey A. Arendt 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 Syst em (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 Dec ision and Orde r. MAHS will not or der 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 ti mely 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 r, or other obvious errors in the hearing decision that effect the substantial rights of the claimant:
- the failure of the ALJ to address ot her relevant iss ues in the hearing decision.

Request must be submitted through the local DHS office or directly to MAHS by mail at

Michigan Administrative hearings Recons ideration/Rehearing Request P. O. Box 30639 Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

CAA/las

