

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 201343333  
Issue No.: 2006  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: June 27, 2013  
County: Macomb 12

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Susanne E. Harris

**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 June 27, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED] and his [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included Eligibility Specialist (ES) [REDACTED].

**ISSUE**

Did the Department properly  deny Claimant's application  close Claimant's case for:

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

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

1. Claimant  applied for benefits  received benefits for:

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

2. On May 1, 2013, the Department  denied Claimant's application  closed Claimant's case due to his failure to submit the required verification.

3. On April 16, 2013, the Department sent  
 Claimant       Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)  
notice of the       denial.     closure.
4. On April 25, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the  
 denial of the application.     closure of the case.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

Department policies are contained 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 of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105.

The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is administered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human Services (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 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.

The ES at the hearing in this case was not the worker who took the action that is the subject of this hearing. The ES testified that the great majority of the requested forms were completed and submitted and she speculated that the previous worker denied the Claimant's application because of a lack of actual medical records. The ES was not certain which verification was missing that resulted in the case being closed. The Department's DHS-3503, Verification Checklist indicates that medical records can be used in lieu of the DHS-49, Medical Examination Report. The evidence in this case was that the Claimant had submitted a completed DHS-49, Medical Examination Report.

Bridges Assistance Manual (BAM) 130 (2012) p. 5 provides that verifications are considered to be timely if received by the date they are due. It instructs Department workers to send a negative action notice when the client indicates refusal to provide a verification, or when the time period given has elapsed and the client has not made a reasonable effort to provide it. In this case, the Administrative Law Judge determines that the time period to submit the verification had lapsed but that the Claimant had made reasonable efforts to provide the verification. As such, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department has not met its burden of establishing that it was acting in accordance with policy when taking action to close the Claimant's SDA case for failure to submit the required verification.

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  improperly denied Claimant's application  properly closed Claimant's case  improperly closed Claimant's case for:  AMP  FIP  FAP  MA  SDA  CDC.

**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.  did not act properly.

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

THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO DO THE FOLLOWING WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER:

1. Initiate action to re-determine the Claimant's eligibility for SDA back to the closure date, and
2. Initiate action to issue the Claimant any supplement he may thereafter be due.

/s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
Susanne E. Harris  
Administrative Law Judge  
For Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 7/1/13  
Date Mailed: 7/1/13

**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 **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

SEH/tb

cc:

