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

	THE				_
IN	IHE	MA	TTFF	ર ()	ь.

	The state of the s	

Reg. No.: 2013-38802

1021

Issue No.:

County:

Case No.: Hearing Date:

July 31, 2013 Kent County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Corey A. Arendt

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 following Claim ant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on J uly 31, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included and Participants on behalf of Department of Human Servic es (Department) included and

ISSUE

Due to a failure to comply with the ve rif properly ⊠ deny Claimant's application ☐ obenefits for:	ication requirements, did the Department close Claimant's case
Family Independence Program (FIP)? Food Assistance Program (FAP)? Medical Assistance (MA)?	☐ State Disability Assistance (SDA)? ☐ Child Development and Care (CDC)?

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the competent, material, and substantia I evidence on the whole record, including testimony of witnesses, finds as material fact:

- 1. On January 7, 2013, the Claimant applied for FIP benefits.
- On January 8, 2013, the D epartment sent the Claimant a verification checklist. The checklist was due by January 18, 2013. Pa rt of the checklist included school verifications.
- 3. As of January 18, 2013, the Claimant had not submitted the school verifications.

- 4. On January 29, 2013, the Department sent the Claimant a notice of case action. The notice indicated the Claimant's FIP application was being denied due to a failure to verify information.
- 5. On March 27, 2013, the Claimant request ed a hearing to dispute the FIP application denial.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

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

The FIP was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 42 USC 601, *et seq*. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq*., and 1999 AC, R 400.3101 through Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996.

Clients must cooperate with the local office in determining initial and ongoing eligibility. This includes completion of necessary forms. Client's must completely and truthfully answer all questions on forms and in interviews.

The client might be unable to answer a question about himself or another person whose circumstances must be known. Allow the c lient at least 10 days (or other timeframe specified in policy) to obtain the needed information.

Testimony and other evidence must be we ighed and considered according to its reasonableness. Moreover, the weight and credibi lity 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 verifications that were missing were never returned as required. Although the Claimant indicates the veri fications were submitted, his testimony is self-serving in the absence of the corresponding fax verification.

Accordingly, I **AFFIRM** the Department's actions in this matter.

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 based upon the above F indings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, the Department did act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's decision is AFFIRMED.

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

Date Signed: August 1, 2013

Date Mailed: August 1, 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 order 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

2013-38802/CAA

CAA/las

