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:	201344533 1005; 3008; 2006;6015 June 6, 2013 Monroe		
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Susanne E	E. Harris			
HEARING DI	<u>ECISION</u>			
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 6, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Below Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included Family Independence Specialist (FIS)				
<u>ISSUE</u>				
Did the Department properly \boxtimes deny Claima for:	nt's application 🗌 cl	ose Claimant's case		
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)?☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)?☐ Medical Assistance (MA)?		sistance (AMP)? ssistance (SDA)? ent and Care (CDC)?		
Did the Department properly \square deny Claimant's application \boxtimes close Claimant's case for:				
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)? ☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)? ☐ Medical Assistance (MA)?		sistance (AMP)? ssistance (SDA)? ent and Care (CDC)?		
FINDINGS C	OF FACT			
The Administrative Law Judge, based on t evidence on the whole record, finds as material	•	rial, and substantial		
 Claimant ⊠ applied for benefits ☐ receive ∑ Family Independence Program (FIP). ☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP). ☐ Medical Assistance (MA). 	Adult Medical As State Disability A	ssistance (AMP). Assistance (SDA). ent and Care (CDC).		

2.	Claimant ☐ applied for benefits ☒ received benefits for:			
	 ☐ Family Independence Program (FIP). ☐ Adult Medical Assistance (AMP). ☐ State Disability Assistance (SDA). ☐ Child Development and Care (CDC). 			
3.	On, April 1, 2013, the Department ⊠ denied Claimant's FIP application □ closed Claimant's case due to her failure to return verification of employment.			
4.	On June 1, 2013, the Department denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's FAP, MA and CDC cases due to her failure to return verification of employment.			
5.	On April 22, 2013, the Department sent Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the FIP denial and FAP, MA and CDC closures.			
6.	On April 26, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the \boxtimes denial of the FIP application and \square closure of the FAP, MA and CDC cases.			
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW				
	epartment policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the idges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).			
Re 42 Ag thr	The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal esponsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence gency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, R 400.3101 rough Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program fective 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 pency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, R 400.3001 rough 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). Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence jency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MCL 0.105.			

The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is administered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, <i>et seq</i> .
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, <i>et seq.</i> , 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.
and she had no verification to give the Department. She stated that she telephoned her worker several times to convey this but did not receive a return telephone call. The Department FIS testified that she did not remember receiving any telephone calls. Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 130 p. 2 instructs Department workers to tell the Claimant what verification is required, how to obtain it and the due date using the DHS-3503, Verification Checklist. In this case, the DHS-3503, Verification Checklist reads, "Please provide additional information about: Employment Unknown." The Administrative Law Judge concludes that the DHS-3503, Verification Checklist is confusing. It does not specifically tell the Claimant what verification is required. As such, it lends credibility to the Claimant's testimony that she relephoned her worker. Likely, the FIS should have also attached a DHS-38, Verification Checklist that verification of income was needed. As such, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that when the Department took action to close the Claimant's FAP, MA, and CDC cases and took action to deny the Claimant's application for FIP, the Department was not acting 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 improperly denied Claimant's application properly closed Claimant's case improperly closed Claimant's case for: AMP FIP FAP MA SDA CDC.
□ 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

of Law finds that the Department \square did act properly. \square did not act properly.
Accordingly, the Department's \square AMP \boxtimes FIP \boxtimes FAP \boxtimes MA \square SDA \boxtimes CDC decision is \square AFFIRMED \boxtimes REVERSED.
\boxtimes THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO DO THE FOLLOWING WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER:
 Initiate action to reinstate the Claimant's FAP, MA, and CDC cases back to June 1, 2013, and re-determine the Claimant's eligibility for those programs, and Initiate action to re-determine the Claimant's eligibility for FIP back to the original application date, and Issue the Claimant any supplements she may thereafter be due.
/s/ Susanne E. Harris

Date Signed: 6/10/13

Date Mailed: 6/10/13

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.

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

- 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.

201344533/SEH

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



