

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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2013 8300
Issue No.: 1038, 2006
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: December 17, 2012
County: Wayne (17)

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 December 17, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED] ES.

ISSUE

Due to a failure to comply with the verification requirements, did the Department properly deny Claimant's application close Claimant's case reduce Claimant's benefits for:

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

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:

1. Claimant applied for Medical Assistance was receiving FAP: FIP FAP MA SDA CDC.
2. Claimant was required to submit the requested verification by completing the redetermination and phone interview by 9/6/12.

3. On 11/1/12, the Department denied the Claimant's Medical Assistance application and closed the FAP case effective 11/1/12
 - denied Claimant's application.(Medical)
 - closed Claimant's case. (Food Assistance)
 - reduced Claimant's benefits.

4. On 10/20/12, the Department sent notice of the
 - denial of Claimant's application.
 - closure of Claimant's case.
 - reduction of Claimant's benefits.

5. On 10/24/12, 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 AACRS 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 AACRS 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, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105.

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program which provides financial assistance for disabled persons is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 1998-2000 AACRS R 400.3151-400.3180.

The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE and XX of the Social Security Act, the Child Care and Development 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 Federal Regulations, Parts 98 and 99. The Department provides services to adults and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and 1997 AACSR 400.5001-5015.

Additionally, the Department sent the Claimant a redetermination dated 8/14/12 as well as a telephone appointment notice scheduled for 9/6/12. The Claimant claimed to have only received the notice of telephone interview but the entire redetermination packet was sent to the correct address for the Claimant at that time. The proper mailing and addressing of a letter creates a presumption of receipt. That presumption may be rebutted by evidence. *Stacey v Sankovich*, 19 Mich App 638 (1969); *Good v Detroit Automobile Inter-Insurance Exchange*, 67 Mich App 270 (1976). In this case the Claimant did not rebut the presumption that the packet was received.

The Claimant testified that she attempted to reschedule the phone interview by leaving a note for her caseworker after the interview appointment date of 9/6/12. The Claimant also stated that she missed the telephone interview because she had no phone minutes. In this case it is determined that the Claimant did not respond to the redetermination in a timely manner and did not take steps to reschedule her telephone interview or complete the redetermination. The Claimant did not bring phone records to substantiate her claims that she called her caseworker several times to reschedule and also did not advise the Department that she may have been unavailable because she was hospitalized. The Claimant's testimony was confusing and contradictory and is determined to be not credible to establish her attempts at contacting the Department to resolve the redetermination.

Under these circumstances it is determined that the Department properly denied the Claimant's Medical Assistance application and closed the Claimant's FAP case as it had no basis to believe that the Claimant intended to respond to the redetermination. Thus the Department's actions are appropriate and correct and in accordance with department policy found in Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 130 (12/2012).

The Claimant may reapply for Medical Assistance and Food Assistance at any time. .

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

closed Claimant's case for Food Assistance.


denied Claimant's application for Medical Assistance.

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
 did act properly did not act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's decision is AFFIRMED REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.


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

Date Signed: December 21, 2012

Date Mailed: December 21, 2012

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.

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

LMF/cl

cc:

