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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.:	201348753
Issue No.:	2001; 3019
Case No.:	
Hearing Date:	June 25, 2013
County:	SSPC-WEST

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 25, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included **Exercise**. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included Assistance Payments Worker,

ISSUE

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

	imes
İ	

Family Independence Program (FIP)? Food Assistance Program (FAP)?

Medical Assistance (MA)?

Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)?

State Disability Assistance (SDA)?

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:



Family Independence Program (FIP). Food Assistance Program (FAP).

Medical Assistance (MA).

- Adult Medical Assistance (AMP). State Disability Assistance (SDA).
- Child Development and Care (CDC).
- On May 9, 2013, the Department
 denied Claimant's application for AMP
 clo due to his failure to return the requested verification.

closed Claimant's case

- 4. On May 9, 2013, the Department sent
 □ Claimant □ Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)
 □ notice of the □ AMP denial. □ closure.
- On April 4, 2013, the Department sent
 ☐ Claimant ☐ Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the ☐ FAP denial. ☐ closure.
- 6. On May 17, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the \square denial of the application. \square 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.

201348753/SEH

☐ 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.

At the onset of the hearing, the Claimant explained that he understood that he was not eligible for FAP as a student that does not work at least 20 hours per week. Because he understood that the Department's action regarding his FAP case was proper, the Claimant testified that he was willing to consent to having the FAP portion of his hearing request dismissed.

Regarding the denial of AMP benefits, the only contested fact in this case is whether or not the Claimant informed the Department's worker that he would have two pay check stubs for the month of April. The testimony of the state of the state of the credible and persuasive in this regard, as it is consistent with notes in evidence which were made contemporaneous with the Claimant's interview. The uncontested facts are as follows: The Claimant only had one paycheck stub and he asked his employer,

to forward that stub and his employer did fax that to the Department on May 7, 2013. (Department's Exhibit 6) The Department then denied the Claimant's application on May 9, 2013. Indicated that the Claimant was otherwise eligible for AMP but for the failure to submit the second pay check stub.

Bridges Assistance Manual (BAM) 130 (2012) pp. 5, 6 provides that verifications are considered to be timely if received by the date they are due. BAM 130 p. 6 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 the Claimant had made a reasonable effort to provide the verification. The Claimant contacted his employer and the employer faxed in his pay check stub because the Claimant cannot obtain the information himself. The employer faxed only one pay check stub and the Claimant had indicated that he would likely have two pay check stubs. BAM 130 p. 6, instructs Departmental workers to give the Claimant a reasonable opportunity to resolve any discrepancy between his statements and information from another source before determining eligibility. The Claimant in this case had no such opportunity to resolve that discrepancy before his application was denied. 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 deny the Claimant's AMP application 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 improperly 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 \Box did act properly. \Box 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. As the Department's testimony was that the Claimant was otherwise eligible for AMP as he had no additional income, the Department is to initiate action to open the Claimant's AMP case retroactive to the application 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: 6/26/13

Date Mailed: 6/28/13

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.
- 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

