

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2013-33425  
Issue No.: 2006  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: August 21, 2013  
County: Macomb-12 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 Claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on August 21, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

**ISSUE**

Due to a failure to comply with verification requirements, did the Department properly deny the Claimant's application for Medical Assistance (MA) and Retro MA (MA-P)?

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

I find as material fact based upon competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, including testimony of witnesses:

1. On August 2, 2012, the Claimant applied for MA benefits.
2. On December 3, 2012, the Department sent the Claimant a verification checklist. The verifications were due December 13, 2012.
3. On December 13, 2012, [REDACTED] requested an extension until December 23, 2012 to return the requested verifications.
4. On or around December 13, 2012, the Department granted the extension request.
5. On December 20, 2012, the Department sent the Claimant a quick note indicating his August 2, 2012 application was denied for failure to return the requested verifications.
6. On December 23, 2012 [REDACTED] requested another extension until January 2, 2013.

7. On approximately December 27, 2013, [REDACTED] received the quick note and sent the Claimant's file to their hearing department.
8. On February 8, 2013, [REDACTED] requested a hearing regarding their receipt of the quick note.
9. On February 13, 2013, the Department contacted [REDACTED] and requested the verifications. [REDACTED] indicated they could not provide the requested information as they had already sent the file to their hearings department.
10. On February 13, 2013, the Department sent the Claimant a notice of case action indicating the Claimant's August 2, 2012 application was being denied.

### **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 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 (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105.

Clients have the right to contest a Department decision affecting eligibility or benefit levels whenever it is believed that the decision is incorrect. The Department will provide an administrative hearing to review the decision and determine the appropriateness of that decision. (BAM 600).

Department policy indicates that clients must cooperate with the local office in determining initial and ongoing eligibility with all programs. (BAM 105). This includes completion of the necessary forms. Clients who are able to but refuse to provide necessary information or take a required action are subject to penalties. (BAM 105).

Testimony and other evidence must be weighed and considered according to its reasonableness.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, the weight and credibility of this evidence is generally for the fact-finder to determine.<sup>2</sup> In evaluating the credibility and weight to be given to the testimony of a witness, the fact-finder may consider the demeanor of the witness, the reasonableness of the witness's testimony, and the interest, if any, the witness may have in the outcome of the matter.<sup>3</sup>

The facts in this case were not in dispute. The Department indicated they sent the quick note in error after granting the first extension and failed to follow up on the error. In failing to notify [REDACTED] of the error, [REDACTED] requested a hearing after treating the quick note

---

<sup>1</sup> *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).

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

<sup>3</sup> *People v Wade*, 303 Mich 303 (1942), *cert den*, 318 US 783 (1943).

as an official notice of denial. I do not find anything wrong with [REDACTED]'s position to send the file to their hearings department to request a hearing after receiving the quick note.

Although the Department witness indicated she provided the Claimant and [REDACTED] until February 13, 2013 to return the verifications, there was nothing in writing ever provided to [REDACTED] or the Claimant to notify them of the Department's position.

Therefore, I too treat the quick note as a possible negative action and believe [REDACTED] had every reason to believe the application was denied as far back as December 20, 2012. And because the quick note was sent in error, I am reversing the Department's actions in this matter.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

I find, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, that the Department did not act properly.

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

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

1. Initiate a redetermination as to the Claimant's eligibility for MA and MA-P benefits beginning August 2, 2012 and issue retroactive benefits if otherwise eligible and qualified.



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

Date Signed: August 21, 2013

Date Mailed: August 22, 2013

**NOTICE OF APPEAL:** 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 or

Reconsideration was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the Decision and Order of Reconsideration or Rehearing Decision.

A Request for Rehearing or Reconsideration may be granted when one of the following exists:

- Newly discovered evidence that existed at the time of the original hearing that could affect the outcome of the original hearing decision;
- Misapplication of manual policy or law in the hearing decision which led to a wrong conclusion;
- Typographical, mathematical or other obvious error in the hearing decision that affects the rights of the client;
- Failure of the ALJ to address in the hearing decision relevant issues raised in the hearing request.

The Department, AHR or the claimant must specify all reasons for the request. MAHS will not review any response to a request for rehearing/reconsideration. A request must be *received* in MAHS within 30 days of the date the hearing decision is mailed.

The written request must be faxed to (517) 335-6088 and be labeled as follows:

Attention: MAHS Rehearing/Reconsideration Request

If submitted by mail, the written request must be addressed as follows:

Michigan Administrative Hearings  
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request  
P.O. Box 30639  
Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

CAA/las

cc:

