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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2 Issue No.: 3 Case No.: Hearing Date: 1 County: 1

201322047 3006 February 7, 2013 Macomb County DHS #20

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Suzanne Morris

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 February 7, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included

ISSUE

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

\Box	
imes	

Family Independence Program (FIP)? Food Assistance Program (FAP)? State Disability Assistance (SDA)?

Child Development and Care (CDC)?

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 was receiving: FIP KAP MA SDA CDC.
- 2. Claimant 🖾 was 🗌 was not provided with a Wage Verification (DHS-4638) for both himself and his wife.
- 3. Claimant was required to submit requested verification by December 7, 2012. The claimant submitted his Wage Verification on December 11, 2012, after the due date and no verification was submitted for his wife.

- 4. On February 1, 2013, the Department
 - denied Claimant's application
 - \boxtimes closed Claimant's case

reduced Claimant's benefits

for failure to submit verification in a timely manner.

5. On January 4, 2013, the Department sent notice of the denial of Claimant's application.

Closure of Claimant's case.

reduction of Claimant's benefits.

6. On January 9, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the ☐ denial. ☐ closure. ☐ reduction.

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 1999 AC, R 400.3101 through Rule 400.3131. 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 1999 AC, R 400.3001 through Rule 400.3015.

☐ 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 2000 AACS, R 400.3151 through Rule 400.3180.

The Child Development an	d Care (CDC) progr	am is established by	Titles IVA, IVE
and XX of the Social Security	/ Act, the Child Ca	re 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.

Additionally, the claimant testified that he did not receive the Wage Verification for his wife. However, it was mailed by the department to the correct address at the same time as his Wage Verification. The department did not have the information to be able to budget the claimant's case and therefore, closed the case properly. Claimant was advised to submit a new application to restart his eligibility for FAP benefits.

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.

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 reas	ons stated on the record, finds that the Department
🛛 did act properly.	did not act properly.

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

<u>/s/</u>____

Suzanne L. Morris Administrative Law Judge For Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: February 8, 2013

Date Mailed: February 11, 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 receipt 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 <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 Reconsideration/Rehearing Request P. O. Box 30639 Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

CC:			