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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2013-52939 Issue Nos.: 2006, 3008 Case No.:

Hearing Date: July 15, 2013 County: Macomb (50-20)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Michael J. Bennane

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 15, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included

<u>ISSUE</u>

Did the Department properly reduce Claimant's Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits and close Claimant's case for Medical Assistance (MA)?

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)
2.	On May 1, 2013, the Department ☐ denied Claimant's application ☐ closed Claimant's case due to noncooperation with the Office of Child Support (OCS).	

3. On March 30, 2013, the Department sent Claimant a notice of the reduction of her FAP benefits.

- 4. On April 3, 2013, the Department sent the claimant a notice of the closure of her MA.
- 5. On June 18, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the closure of her MA and reduction of her FAP benefits

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 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, Rule 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.

At the hearing, Claimant stated that she had provided the OCS with all the information she had about the father of the child in question.

The Department stated that it did not have any evidence that Claimant was withholding information about the child in question.

In *Black v Dept of Social Services*, 195 Mich App 27 (1992), the Court of Appeals addressed the issue of burden of proof in a non-cooperation finding. Specifically, the court in *Black* ruled that to support a finding of non-cooperation, the agency has the burden of proof to establish that the mother (1) failed to provide the requested verification and that (2) the mother knew the requested information. The *Black* court also emphasized the fact that the mother testified under oath that she had no further information and the agency failed to offer any evidence that the mother knew more than she was disclosing. *Black* at 32-34.

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 improperly closed Claimant's MA case and reduced her FAP benefits.

DECISION AND ORDER

	stated on the record, finds that the Department did not act properly.
Accordingly, the Departme is	nt's \square AMP \square FIP \boxtimes FAP \boxtimes MA \square SDA \square CDC decision RSED for the reasons stated on the record.
	ORDERED TO DO THE FOLLOWING WITHIN 10 DAYS OF F THIS DECISION AND ORDER:

 Initiate reinstatement of Claimant's MA case back to the date of closure and restore her FAP benefits back to the reduction date and supplement for any missed benefits.

Michael J. Bennane
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: July 23, 2013

Date Mailed: July 23, 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 **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 affect the substantial rights of the claimant,
 - failure of the ALJ to address other relevant issues in the hearing decision.

2013-52939/MJB

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

MJB/pf

