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:	20131744 6015 February 21, 2013 Kalamazoo
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Susanne E		
HEARING D	<u>ECISION</u>	
This matter is before the undersigned Administration and MCL 400.37 following Claimant's required telephone hearing was held on Februar Participants on behalf of Claimant included Department of Human Services (Department Specialist (ES).	lest for a hearing. y 21, 2013, from . Par	After due notice, a
<u>ISSU</u>	<u>'E</u>	
Did the Department properly 🛛 deny Claima for:	ant's application 🗌 c	lose Claimant's case
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)?☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)?☐ Medical Assistance (MA)?		esistance (AMP)? Assistance (SDA)? ent and Care (CDC)?
FINDINGS (OF FACT	
The Administrative Law Judge, based on evidence on the whole record, finds as material	•	rial, and substantial
Claimant ⊠ applied for benefits □ received benefits for:		
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP).☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP).☐ Medical Assistance (MA).	State Disability	ssistance (AMP). Assistance (SDA). ent and Care (CDC).

2.	On September26, 2012, the Department denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's case due to the Claimant's failure to provide verification of her day care provider's address.
3.	On September 26, 2012, the Department sent Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the denial. Closure.
4.	On October 1, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the denial of the application. Closure of the case.
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
	epartment policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the dges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).
Re 42 Ag thr	The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal sponsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence ency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, R 400.3101 ough Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program ective October 1, 1996.
pro im Re Ag	The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) ogram] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is plemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal egulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence ency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, R 400.3001 ough Rule 400.3015.
Se Th Ag	The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social curity Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). e Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence ency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MCL 0.105.
□ ad	The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is ministered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq.
for Se pro	The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human rvices (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA ogram pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 2000 AACS, R 400.3151 through Rule 0.3180.

☐ 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 1999 AC, R 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.		
In this case, the Claimant applied for CDC on June 4, 2012 and she testified that she also provided the required verification on that day. The Department testified that they had no verification of the day care provider's address and therefore sent the Claimant a DHS-3503 Verification Checklist on August 15, 2012 and then again on September 15, 2012, as the Claimant was granted an extension to provide such and was given until September 21, 2012 to do so. The Department also testified that the Claimant telephoned to check on her CDC application on September 15, 2012 and that she was also informed verbally that the Department was waiting on the verification of the day care provider's address before approving her case.		
The Claimant testified that she also dropped off a copy of the sometime in August. The Department testified that the drop box logs for August 15-31, 2012 and September 15-28, 2012 were checked, and they do not have any signature from the Claimant indicating that anything was dropped off. The testimony of ES Thompson is specific, logical and consistent with the meticulous documentation in the record. In contrast, the Claimant's testimony is not at all specific and vague. The Claimant's testimony is therefore found to be less than credible. The Administrative Law Judge is persuaded that the Department met its burden of proving that the denial of Claimant's CDC application was in accordance with its policy.		
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 denied Claimant's application ☐ properly closed Claimant's case ☐ improperly denied Claimant's application ☐ improperly closed Claimant's case 		
for:		
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 \infty \text{did act properly.} \text{did not act properly.}		

Accordingly, the Department's \square AMP \square FIP \square FAP \square MA \square SDA \boxtimes CDC decision is \boxtimes AFFIRMED \square REVERSED.

Susanne E. Harris

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

Susanne E Hanis

Date Signed: 3/22/13 Date Mailed: 3/22/13

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 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

CC:

SHE/db

