

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No: 201320659  
Issue No: 3008  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: January 31, 2013  
Kent County DHS

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Suzanne D. Sonneborn

**HEARING DECISION**

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon Claimant's request for a hearing received by the Department of Human Services (department) on December 26, 2012. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on January 31, 2013. Claimant appeared by conference call and provided testimony. The department was represented by Amy Wright, a family independence manager, and [REDACTED], a case manager, both with the department's Kent County office.

**ISSUE**

Whether the Department of Human Services (department) properly denied Claimant's application for Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits for failure to return the required verification?

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

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

1. On November 26, 2012, Claimant applied for FAP benefits. (Department Hearing Summary)
2. On November 28, 2012, the department mailed Claimant a Verification Checklist (DHS 3503), requesting that Claimant provide verification of vehicle ownership for her and her husband, her husband's loss of employment, and her vehicle value. This information was due to the department by December 10, 2012. The Notice further provided that if Claimant had questions regarding the Notice, she was to contact her specialist, [REDACTED] at (616) 248-1165. (Department Exhibit A)

3. Claimant did not provide the department with the requested verifications by the December 10, 2012 deadline.
4. On December 12, 2012, the department mailed Claimant a Notice of Case Action (DHS 1605), informing her that her application for FAP benefits had been denied due to her failure to provide the required verifications. (Department Exhibit B)
5. On December 17, 2012, Claimant requested a hearing contesting the department's denial of her application for FAP benefits.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

The regulations governing the hearing and appeal process for applicants and recipients of public assistance in Michigan are found in the Michigan Administrative Code, MAC R 400.901-400.951. An opportunity for a hearing shall be granted to an applicant who requests a hearing because his claim for assistance is denied. MAC R 400.903(1)

Clients have the right to contest a department decision affective eligibility for benefit levels whenever it is believed that the decision is incorrect. BAM 600. The department will provide an administrative hearing to review the decision and determine the appropriateness of that decision. BAM 600.

The Food Assistance Program (FAP) was established pursuant to 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 of Human Services (DHS or department) administers the FAP program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MAC R 400.30001-3015. Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

Department policy indicates that clients must cooperate with the local office in determining initial and ongoing eligibility with all programs. BAM 105. This includes completion of the necessary forms. Clients who are able to but refuse to provide necessary information or take a required action are subject to penalties. BAM 105. Clients must take actions within their ability to obtain verifications. BAM 130; BEM 702. Likewise, DHS local office staff must assist clients who ask for help in completing forms. BAM 130; BEM 702; BAM 105.

Verification is usually required upon application or redetermination and for a reported change affecting eligibility or benefit level. BAM 130. The department must allow a client 10 calendar days (or other time limit specified in policy) to provide the requested verification. BAM 130. If the client is unable to provide the verification despite a reasonable effort, the department must extend the time limit at least once. BAM 130. . For MA, if the client cannot provide the verification despite a reasonable effort, the time limit is extended up to three times. BAM 130. Should the client indicate a refusal to

provide a verification or, conversely, if the time period given has elapsed and the client has not made a reasonable effort to provide it, the department may send the client a negative action notice. BAM 130. (Emphasis added).

In the instant case, Claimant is disputing the department's denial of her application for FAP benefits for failure to provide the requested verifications. At the January 31, 2013 hearing, Claimant testified that she requested assistance from the department in obtaining the required verification – however, she acknowledged that she contacted [REDACTED] the case specialist listed on Claimant's Notice of Case Action, not [REDACTED] the specialist she was instructed to contact on the Verification Checklist. Based on these two Notices, as well as Claimant's testimony, it is clear that Claimant's request for assistance with the Verification Checklist did not occur until after Claimant's FAP application had been denied.

Consequently, the Administrative Law Judge finds that based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence presented during the hearing, the department acted in accordance with policy in denying Claimant's application for FAP benefits for failure to return the required verifications.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the department acted in accordance with policy in denying Claimant's application for FAP benefits for failure to return the required verifications. Accordingly, the department's action in this regard is **UPHELD**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/

\_\_\_\_\_  
Suzanne D. Sonneborn  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: February 1, 2013

Date Mailed: February 1, 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 60 days of the filing of the original request.

The Claimant may appeal this 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 errors, or other obvious errors in the hearing decision that affect the substantial rights of 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 System  
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request  
P.O. Box 30639  
Lansing, MI 48909-07322

SDS/cr

cc:

