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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2013-52741

Issue No.: 3008 Case No.:

Hearing Date: July 16, 2013

County: DHS-SSPC-WEST

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Corey A. Arendt

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Admin and MCL 400.37 following Claim ant's requtelephone hearing was held on J uly 16, 201 behalf of Claimant inc luded Human Services (Department) included	uest for a hearing. After due notice, a
<u>ISS</u>	<u>UE</u>
Did the Departm ent properly $oxtime \boxtimes$ deny Claim for:	an t's application 🔲 close Claimant's case
☐ 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 t he competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

- 1. On April 25, 2013, the Claimant applied for FAP benefits.
- 2. On April 27, 2013, the Department attempt ed to contact the Claim ant to participate in an intake interview. The Department was unable to reach the Claimant.
- 3. On April 27, 2013, the Department sent the Claimant an appoint ment notice. The notice indicated an interview date of May 6, 2013.
- 4. On May 6, 2013, the Department attemp ted to contact the Claimant but was unable to reach him.
- 5. On May 6, 2013, the Department sent t he Claimant a notice of missed int erview. The notice indicated the Claimant had until May 25, 2013 to complete the interview.

- 6. On May 15, 2013, the Claimant called the Department and left a message.
- 7. On May 24, 2013, the Department attempted to contact the Claimant but was unable to reach him.
- 8. On May 28, 2013, the Depart ment denied the Claimant's a pplication for FAP benefits for failing to participate in the intake interview process.
- 9. On June 10, 2013, the Claimant requested a hearing.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Department policies are contained in the Br idges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

The FAP [formerly known as the Food Stamp (F S) program] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in T itle 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.

Interviews are required to explain program requirements and to gather information to determine eligibility. The De partment is allowed to deny applications after the 30 th day from application if the Claimant has not participated in an interview. BAM 115.

In this case, the Department denied t he application because the Claimant did not participate in an intake interview.

Testimony and other evidence must be we ighed and considered according to its reasonableness. Moreover, the weight and credibility of this evidence is generally for the fact-finder to determine. In evaluating the credibility and weight to be given the testimony of a witness, the fact-finder may consider the demeanor of the witness, the reasonableness of the witness is testimony, and the interest, if any, the witness may have in the outcome of the matter.

I have carefully considered and weighed the testimony and other evidence in the record and find the Department witnesses to be slightly more credible than the Claimant as the Department witnesses had a clearer recollection of the dates, times and events in question. Therefore, I find that more likely than not, the Claimant did not participate in the intake interview as alleged and therefore, the Department properly denied the FAP application.

2

¹ *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).

² Dep't of Community Health, 274 Mich App at 372; People v Terry, 224 Mich App 447, 452; 569 NW2d 641 (1997).

³ People v Wade, 303 Mich 303 (1942), cert den, 318 US 783 (1943).

DECISION AND ORDER

I find, bas ed upon the above Findings of Fa ct and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, the Department did act properly in this matter.

Accordingly, the Department's decision is **AFFIRMED**.

Corey A. Arendt Administrative Law Judge For Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: July 17, 2013

Date Mailed: July 17, 2013

NOTICE: Michigan Administrative Hearing Syst em (MAHS) may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a par ty within 30 days of the mailing date of this Dec ision and Order. MAHS will not or der a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's mo tion where the final decis ion 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 ti mely 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 ot her relevant iss ues in the hearing decision.

Request must be submitted through the local DHS office or directly to MAHS by mail at Michigan Administrative hearings

Recons ideration/Rehearing Request

P. O. Box 30639

Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

2013-52741/CAA

CAA/las



