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:	201349507 2006; 3008 June 26, 2013 Macomb 12
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Susanne E	E. Harris	
HEARING D	<u>ECISION</u>	
This matter is before the undersigned Administration and MCL 400.37 following Claimant's required telephone hearing was held on June 26, 2013 behalf of Claimant included Human Services (Department) included Eligib	lest for a hearing. B, from Lansing, Michi Participants on beha	After due notice, a gan. Participants on
<u>ISSU</u>	<u>E</u>	
Did the Department properly deny Claima for:	ant's application 🗵 c	lose Claimant's case
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)? ☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)? ☐ Medical Assistance (MA)?	State Disability A	sistance (AMP)? Assistance (SDA)? ent and Care (CDC)?
FINDINGS C	OF FACT	
The Administrative Law Judge, based on the evidence on the whole record, finds as material		rial, and substantial
Claimant ☐ applied for benefits ☒ receive	ed benefits for:	
 ☐ Family Independence Program (FIP). ☑ Food Assistance Program (FAP). ☑ Medical Assistance (MA). 	State Disability	ssistance (AMP). Assistance (SDA). ent and Care (CDC).
2. On June 1, 2013, the Department ☐ denied Claimant's application ☐ cle	osed Claimant's case	

due to his failure to submit the required verification.

	On May 3, 2013, the Department sent Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the denial. Closure.
4.	On May 29, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the ☐ denial of the application. ☐ closure of the case.
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
	partment policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the dges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).
Res 42 Age	The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal sponsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence ency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, R 400.3101 ough Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program ective October 1, 1996.
pro imp Reg Age	The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) gram] 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 gulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence ency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, R 400.3001 bugh Rule 400.3015.
Sec The Age	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 ency) 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 ministered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq.
for Ser pro	The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human rvices (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA gram pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 2000 AACS, R 400.3151 through Rule 0.3180.
and 199 The	The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE d XX of the Social Security Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 90, and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. It is program is implemented by Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 98 d 99. The Department provides services to adults and children pursuant to MCL 0.14(1) and 1999 AC. R 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.

Date Mailed: 7/1/13

In this case, the Claimant maintained that he had problems with his mail, which is sometimes tampered with. Yet, when asked, the Claimant did not indicate that he had problems receiving the documents from the Department. He expressed that he did not know why the Department did not have those documents because he did sent them in the mail. The Department conceded it received the required work information, but not until well after the Claimant's case had closed. The testimony of the ES in this case is found to be credible and persuasive, as it is logical, specific and consistent with other evidence in the record.

Bridges Assistance Manual (BAM) 130 (2012) p. 5 provides that verifications are considered to be timely if received by the date they are due. BAM 130 p. 5 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 and the Claimant had made no reasonable effort to provide the verification. As such, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department has met its burden of establishing that it was acting in accordance with policy when taking action to close the Claimant's MA and FAP 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 \boxtimes did act properly. \square did not act properly.
Accordingly, the Department's \square AMP \square FIP \boxtimes FAP \boxtimes MA \square SDA \square CDC decision s \boxtimes AFFIRMED \square REVERSED.
/s/ Susanne E. Harris Administrative Law Judge For Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services
Date Signed: 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 <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

