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

		ΓFR	

	Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	2013-55808 3008 July 29, 2013 Macomb (20)					
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Jan Leventer							
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 29, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Research Religibility Specialist.							
<u>ISSUE</u>							
Did the Department properly \square deny Claimant's application \boxtimes close Claimant's case for:							
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)?☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)?☐ Medical Assistance (MA)?		sistance (AMP)? ssistance (SDA)? ent and Care (CDC)?					
FINDINGS OF FACT							
The Administrative Law Judge, based on the competent, material, and substantia							

Adult Medical Assistance (AMP).

State Disability Assistance (SDA).

Child Development and Care (CDC).

evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

Family Independence Program (FIP).

Food Assistance Program (FAP).

Medical Assistance (MA).

1. Claimant ☐ applied for benefits ☒ received benefits for:

2.	On July 1, 2013, the Department denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's case due to a determination that she failed to submit proof of loss of employment and her last paycheck from that employment.				
3.	On June 26, 2013, the Department sent Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the denial. Closure.				
4.	On July 1, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the ☐ denial of the application. ☐ closure of the case.				
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW					
De	partment policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the				

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.

Additionally, the applicable Department manual section in this case is Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 105, "Rights and Responsibilities." BAM 105 requires the Department to determine eligibility, provide benefits, and protect client rights. The client for her or his part, must cooperate fully with the Department's requests for necessary information. Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 105 (2013).

In this case, On June 12, 2013, the Department sent Claimant a Verification Checklist requesting "verification of loss (sic) employment with Able Temp Services and final check." Dept. Exh. 1, p. 5. The deadline for submission was June 24, 2013. The Checklist states that the Specialist is available to assist with questions and help.

The Claimant testified she had some difficulty obtaining the documents. She claimed she called the Department about this, but when asked what message she left on the Specialist's voicemail, she stated she may have said that she was having some trouble getting the documents. In any event, Claimant did not make a request for help from the Department in obtaining the documents.

At the hearing Claimant made it clear that she tried to take care of this on her own, and that she had many other important things going on at the same time. Claimant's Hearing Request of July 1, 2013, says nothing about having difficulty getting the requested documents. Dept. Exh. 1, Hearing Request.

The Department Specialist testified that she had no record in her message log of a call from Claimant. The Claimant did not produce the necessary documentation at the hearing.

Applying BAM 105 to this case, and having reviewed all of the evidence of record in its entirety, it is found and determined that the Department acted correctly in this case in terminating benefits. It is found and determined that the Claimant's testimony is insufficient to establish that she fully cooperated with the Department. Without necessary documents, the Department cannot reliably perform the functions of determining eligibility, providing benefits and protecting client rights. BAM 105.

Based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusi stated on the record, the Administrative Law Judge con				
	erly denied Claimant's application erly closed Claimant's case			
for: AMP FIP FAP MA SDA CDC.				
DECISION AND ORDER				
The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above I of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, finds i did act properly. ☐ did not act properly.	•			
Accordingly, the Department's \square AMP \square FIP \boxtimes FAP is \boxtimes AFFIRMED \square REVERSED for the reasons stated				
	Jan Grenty			
	Jan Leventer Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services			

Date Mailed: July 30, 2013

Date Signed: July 29, 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.

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

JL/tm

