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

IN THE MATTER OF:

| 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 or behalf of Claimant included was not present and could not be reached by telephone when the Administrative Law Judge attempted to conference her into the hearing. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department included Eligibility Specialist (ES) ■ ISSUE Did the Department properly □ deny Claimant's application □ close Claimant's case for: □ Family Independence Program (FIP)? □ Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)? □ State Disability Assistance (SDA)? □ Child Development and Care (CDC)? |
|---|
| 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 or behalf of Claimant included and the second second and Authorized Hearing Representative, was not present and could not be reached by telephone when the Administrative Law Judge attempted to conference her into the hearing. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department included Eligibility Specialist (ES) ISSUE Did the Department properly deny Claimant's application close Claimant's case for: Family Independence Program (FIP)? Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)? Food Assistance Program (FAP)? State Disability Assistance (SDA)? |
| 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 or behalf of Claimant included. His and Authorized Hearing Representative, was not present and could not be reached by telephone when the Administrative Law Judge attempted to conference her into the hearing. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department included Eligibility Specialist (ES) ISSUE Did the Department properly deny Claimant's application close Claimant's case for: Family Independence Program (FIP)? Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)? Food Assistance Program (FAP)? State Disability Assistance (SDA)? |
| Did the Department properly ☐ deny Claimant's application ☒ close Claimant's case for: ☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)? ☐ Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)? ☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)? ☐ State Disability Assistance (SDA)? |
| for: Family Independence Program (FIP)? Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)? State Disability Assistance (SDA)? |
| ☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)? ☐ 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: |
| Claimant ☐ applied for benefits ☐ received benefits for: |
| ☐ Family Independence Program (FIP). ☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP). ☐ Medical Assistance (MA). ☐ Child Development and Care (CDC) |

| 2. | On July 1, 2013, the Department is scheduled to denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's case due to his failure to submit the required verification. |
|------------------------------------|---|
| 3. | On May 28, 2013, the Department sent Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the denial. Closure. |
| 4. | On June 3, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the ☐ denial of the application. ☐ closure of the case. |
| | CONCLUSIONS OF LAW |
| | epartment policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the dges 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 lency) 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 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 lency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, R 400.3001 ough 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). e Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence lency) 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 Se pro | The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human prize (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA ogram pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 2000 AACS, R 400.3151 through Rule 0.3180. |

| ☐ 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. | | |
|---|--|--|
| In this case, it is not contested that the Claimant made no effort to submit the required verifications. Indeed, the ES testified that the Claimant's had agreed to withdraw the hearing request because she knew it was proper to have the case close because neither she nor the Claimant submitted the required verification. This testimony was not contested. 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 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 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 □ improperly closed Claimant's case □ improperly closed Claimant's case | | |
| for: | | |
| 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 \square MA \square SDA \square CDC decision is \boxtimes AFFIRMED \square REVERSED. | | |
| /s/ Susanne E. Harris Administrative Law Judge For Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services Date Signed: 06/28/2013 | | |

3

Date Mailed: <u>07/01/2013</u>

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 <u>MAY</u> 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/sw

