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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 201338608

Issue No.: 3008

Case No.:

County:

Hearing Date: May 1, 2013 SSPC-West

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: C. Adam Purnell

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 three-way telephone hearing was held on May 1, 2013 from Lansing, Michigan. Claimant appeared via telephone and provided testimony. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included (Eligibility Specialist).

ISSUE

Did the Department properly close Claimant's Food Assistance Program (FAP) case due to a failure to comply with the verification requirements?

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:

- Claimant applied for FAP benefits on March 1, 2013.
- 2. During a telephone interview, Claimant reported that his only form of income was doing odd jobs beginning in February, 2013 and that he earned \$200.00.
- 3. On March 7, 2013, the Department mailed Claimant a Self-Employment Income and Expense Statement (DHS-431) and a Verification Checklist (DHS-3503).
- Claimant was required to submit requested verification by March 18, 2013.
- 5. On March 21, 2013, the Department mailed Claimant a Notice of Case Action (DHS-1605) which closed Claimant's FAP case due to failure to submit verification in a timely manner.

6. On March 29, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the FAP closure.

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 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 AACS R 400.3001-3015

Verification means documentation or other evidence to establish the accuracy of the client's verbal or written statements. BAM 130. Verification is usually required upon application or redetermination and for a reported change affecting eligibility or benefit level. BAM 130. Verifications are considered timely if received by the date they are due. BAM 130.

For FAP, the department must allow a client 10 calendar days (or other time limit specified in policy) to provide the requested verification. 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.

Here, the Department maintains that Claimant reported that he earned income from doing "odd jobs." After the Department mailed the verification requests to Claimant, he failed to provide the requested verification on a timely basis, which resulted in FAP closure. Claimant, on the other hand, contends that he did not indicate that he did "odd jobs." Rather, Claimant argues, he and a friend cleaned a garage and hauled some trash for \$50.00. Claimant then states that he actually "turned in all the papers" in March and complied with the verification request.

Testimony and other evidence must be weighed and considered according to its reasonableness. *Gardiner v Courtright*, 165 Mich 54, 62; 130 NW 322 (1911); *Dep't of Community Health v Risch*, 274 Mich App 365, 372; 733 NW2d 403 (2007). The weight and credibility of this evidence is generally for the fact-finder to determine. *Dep't of Community Health*, 274 Mich App at 372; *People v Terry*, 224 Mich App 447, 452; 569 NW2d 641 (1997). Moreover, it is for the fact-finder to gauge the demeanor and veracity of the witnesses who appear before him, as best he is able. See, e.g., *Caldwell v Fox*, 394 Mich 401, 407; 231 NW2d 46 (1975); *Zeeland Farm Services, Inc v JBL Enterprises, Inc*, 219 Mich App 190, 195; 555 NW2d 733 (1996).

This Administrative Law Judge has carefully considered and weighed the testimony and other evidence in the record. Based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence presented during the hearing, this Administrative Law Judge finds that the Department's evidence to be persuasive and the Department representative is more credible. Here, Claimant's statements that he did not mention the words "odd jobs" and that he turned in the verifications are not credible. Claimant has failed to make a

reasonable effort to provide all requested verifications within the required time period. Consequently, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department properly closed Claimant's case.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, finds that the Department did act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's decision is **AFFIRMED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

<u>/s/</u>

C. Adam Purnell Administrative Law Judge For Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: May 7, 2013

Date Mailed: May 7, 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 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 mailing 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.

CAP/aca

CC:

