

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 201345603  
Issue No.: 3008  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: June 11, 2013  
County: SSPC-East

**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 June 11, 2013 from Lansing, Michigan. Claimant participated via telephone and provided testimony. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (Assistance Payments Worker) and [REDACTED] (Departmental Manager).

**ISSUE**

Did the Department properly deny Claimant's Food Assistance Program (FAP) application 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:

1. Claimant applied for FAP on April 1, 2013.
2. On April 15, 2013, the Department mailed Claimant a Verification Checklist (DHS-3503) which sought Claimant's employment information and checking account balance.
3. Claimant was required to submit requested verification by April 25, 2013.
4. On April 30, 2013, the Department mailed Claimant a Notice of Case Action (DHS-1605) which denied Claimant's application for failure to submit verification in a timely manner and due to excess income.

5. On May 8, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the denial.

### **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 AACR 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.

The Department sometimes will utilize a verification checklist (VCL) or a DHS form telling clients what is needed to determine or redetermine eligibility. See Bridges Program Glossary (BPG) at page 47.

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.

For FAP only, if the client contacts the department prior to the due date requesting an extension or assistance in obtaining verifications, the department must assist them with the verifications but not grant an extension. BAM 130. The department worker must explain to the client they will not be given an extension and their case will be denied once the VCL due date is passed. BAM 130. Also, the department worker shall explain their eligibility will be determined based on their compliance date if they return required verifications. BAM 130. The department must re-register the application if the client complies within 60 days of the application date. See BAM 115 & BAM 130.

Generally speaking, the client is obligated to obtain required verification, but the department worker must assist if the client needs and requests help. BAM 130. If neither the client nor the department worker can obtain verification despite a reasonable effort, the department worker must use the best available information. BAM 130. If no evidence is available, the department worker should use his or her best judgment. BAM 130.

Here, the Department submits that Claimant failed to provide all requested verifications. According to the Department, Claimant timely provided the wage verifications but did not send his checking account statements. Claimant, on the other hand, contends that he sent all verifications at the same time.

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. This Administrative Law Judge finds the Department's evidence to be persuasive and the Department representative's testimony is more credible. Claimant has failed to make a reasonable effort to provide all requested verifications within the required time period.

The Department did not include a full budget sheet into evidence. Thus, this Administrative Law Judge does not have enough information to determine whether or not Claimant had excess income at the time. However, this Administrative Law Judge does find that the Department properly denied the application based on the failure to provide verifications.

Based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence presented during the hearing, this Administrative Law Judge finds 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.

/s/

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

Date Signed: June 12, 2013

Date Mailed: June 12, 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:

