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

### IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.:
2013 588

Issue No.:
5003, 3008

Case No.:
Image: County in the second sec

### ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Lynn M. Ferris

# HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Admini strative 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 December 13, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Cla imant included the Claimant and a witnes s, who also appeared. Participant s on behalf of the D epartment of Human Services (Department) included

#### ISSUE

Did the Department properly re duce the Claimant's F ood Assistance August 2012 for failure to return the redetermination?

Did the Department properly deny the Claimant's SER application?

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

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

- 1. The Claim ant requested a hearing about the reduction of her food assistance benefits in August 2012 and the denial of her SER application. Sever al of the hearing requests contained in the file have address labels wit h her apartment number shown on the label.
- 2. At the hearing the Depar tment did not pr ovide the application for SER and the Decision Notice for SER that it referred to in its Hearing Summary.

- 3. The Department received 2 returned ma il letters addressed to the Claimant. The letters did not include the Claimant's apartment number.
- 4. The Depar tment did not establish w hat address the Claim ant used on her SER application referred to in the hearing summary.
- 5. The Department did not have the case file for the Claimant at the hearing.
- 6. The Department did not pr esent a FAP budget to dem onstrate why the Claimant's FAP benefits were reduced in August 2012.
- 7. The Claimant requested a hearing on August 21, 2012 pr otesting the Department's actions due to no apartment number in her mailing address.

# CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Department policies are contained in the Br idges 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 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 Mich Admin Code, R 400.3101 t hrough R 400.3131. FI P replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996.

The Food Assistanc e Program (FAP) [for merly known as the Food Sta mp (FS) program] is establis hed by the Food St amp Act of 1977, as amend ed, and is implemented by the federal r egulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independenc e Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001 through R 400.3015.

☐ The Medical Ass istance (MA) program is es tablished by the Title XIX of the Soc ial Security Act and is im plemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independenc e Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq*., and MC L 400.105.

The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is administered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq*.

The State Disabilit y Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The D epartment of Human

Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq*., and 2000 AACS, R 400.3 151 through R 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 Fede ral Regulations, Parts 98 and 99. The Depart ment provides servic es to adults and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and Mich Admin Code, R 400.5001 through R 400.5015.

The State Emergency Relief (SER) program is establis hed by 2004 PA 344. The SER program is administer ed pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and by 1999 AC, Rul e 400.7001 through Rule 400.7049. Department polic ies are found in the State Emergency Relief Manual (ERM).

Additionally, the Department w as unable to present any information at the hearing regarding whether the Departm ent sent documents to the Claimant at the correct address other than the returned mail. T he evidence showed that the Claimant had received benefits for quite some time wit hout any difficulty receiving doc uments and thus it was incumbent on the Department to produce the SER application to determine what address was provided by the Claimant so a determination could be made as to whether the Department sent the various not ices and redetermination to the correct address for the Claimant. The Claimant credibly testified that she did not h ave trouble receiving her mail and did not ever receive the redetermination. As the Department did not have the case file at the hearing it could not determine what address of record was shown on the SER application and the Claimant's prior applications for FAP which were the two benefits affected which were addressed in the D epartment's hearing summary. The Department also could not address the basis for the SER dec ision as no decision notice was provided nor was the basis for the FAP benefit reduct ion addressed. The issues raised by the Claimant 's hearing request were not addressed as stated above and thus the Department did not meet its burden of proof to demonstrate that its actions were correct and in accordance with Department policy.

# **DECISION AND ORDER**

Accordingly, the Department's  $\square$  AMP  $\square$  FIP  $\boxtimes$  FAP  $\square$  MA  $\square$  SDA  $\square$  CDC and  $\boxtimes$  SER decision is AFFIRMED  $\boxtimes$  REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.

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

- 1. The Department shall initiate recalculation of the Claimant's benefits for August 2012 FAP and if required, allow the Claimant an oppore tunity to complete her redetermination in order to do so.
- 2. The Department shall also re register t he Claimant's SER applic ation referred to in its hearing summary and reproc ess the SE R applic ation to determine Claimant's eligibility.
- 3. If the FAP benefits as issued after recalc ulation are determined to be incorrect, the Department shall issue a supplement if appropriate for any benefits the Claimant was otherwise entitled to receive in accordance with Department policy.

Lvnn M. Ferris

Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: December 19, 2012

Date Mailed: December 19, 2012

**NOTICE:** Michigan Administrative Hearing Syst em (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 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 **MAY** 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

Re consideration/Rehearing Request P. O. Box 30639 Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322



