## 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:	2013 52009 3006 July 10, 2013 Wayne (15)		
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Lynn M. Ferris				
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 July 10, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants or behalf of Claimant included the Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included process.				
<u>ISSUE</u>				
Due to a failure to comply with the verification requirements, did the Department properly $\square$ deny Claimant's application $\boxtimes$ close Claimant's case $\square$ reduce Claimant's benefits for:				
		ssistance (SDA)? nt and Care (CDC)?		
FINDINGS OF FACT				
The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the competent, material, and substantia evidence on the whole record, including testimony of witnesses, finds as material fact:				
1. Claimant ☐ applied for ☒ was receiving: ☐FI	P ⊠FAP □MA [	□SDA □CDC.		

2. Claimant was required to submit requested verification by April 1, 2013 .

3.	On April 30, 2013, the Department  ☐ denied Claimant's application.  ☐ closed Claimant's case automatically due to the failure to complete the redetermination.  ☐ reduced Claimant's benefits.
4.	On June 4, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the denial of Claimant's application.  closure of Claimant's case. reduction of Claimant's benefits.
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
	epartment policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges gibility Manual (BEM) and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).
Re 42 Ag 31	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 Jency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1997 AACS R 400.3101-31. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective ctober 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 Jency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1997 AACS R 0.3001-3015

Additionally, the Claimant credibly testified that she attempted to contact the caseworker associated with her case based upon the Notice of Missed Interview and after 10 calls was unable to reach anyone at the number, as the number was not working. The Department acknowledged during the hearing that the phone number provided was incorrect. Additionally, the Claimant went to the Greydale office for assistance prior to April 30, 2013, (the date the redetermination and interview was to be completed) and was told that they could not assist her at that office.

Under these facts and circumstances the Department did not sustain its burden of proof to demonstrate that the Claimant refused to complete the redetermination. Pursuant to BAM 130 the Claimant did demonstrate willingness and several attempts to complete her obligations relative to the redetermination and was unable to do so despite her efforts. This decision was also influenced by the fact that the Department did not provide the correct phone number to the Claimant to contact the Department to resolve the notice of missed interview. Exhibit 2. Thus it is determined based on the Claimant's credible testimony that the Claimant did not refuse to complete her redetermination and

attempted to provide the Department information to complete same prior to the closure of her case on April 30, 2013.
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 ☐ improperly
DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, finds that the Department  $\square$  did act properly  $\square$  did not act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's decision is  $\square$  AFFIRMED  $\boxtimes$  REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.

☑ THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO DO THE FOLLOWING WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER:

- 1. The Department shall initiate reinstatement of the Claimant's FAP case retroactive to the date of closure, April 30, 2013.
- 2. The Department shall issue a supplement to the Claimant for FAP benefits she was otherwise entitled to receive, if any, in accordance with Department policy. If a redetermination needs to be completed the Department shall proceed accordingly to complete the redetermination; otherwise, benefits will be based upon the current benefit amount received by Claimant due to her new application filed after FAP case closure associated with this case.

Lynn M. Ferris
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: July 16, 2013

Date Mailed: July 16, 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. (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 affect the substantial rights of the claimant,
  - 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

## LMF/cl

