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

IN	TH	ΕI	MAT	ſΤE	RC)F:

Reg. No.: 2013-47648

Issue No.: 4003

Case No.: Hearing Date:

County:

e: July 31, 2013 Wayne (55)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Zainab Baydoun

denied Claimant's application

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 July 31, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. appeared and testified. Partici pants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Assistance Payment Worker. ISSUE Did the Departm ent properly ⊠ deny Claiman t's application ☐ close Claimant's case for: Family Independence Program (FIP)? Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)? Food Assistance Program (FAP)? State Disability Assistance (SDA)? Medical Assistance (MA)? 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. Cla imant
☐ applied for benefits ☐ received benefits for: Family Independence Program (FIP). Adult Medical Assistance (AMP). Food Assistance Program (FAP). State Disability Assistance (SDA). Child Development and Care (CDC). Medical Assistance (MA). 2. On February 16, 2013, the Department

due to Claimant's failure to verify information necessary to determine eligibility.

closed Claimant's case

3.	On February 25, 2013, the Department sent
	☐ Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)
	notice of the denial. closure.
4.	On May 10, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the \boxtimes denial of the application. \square closure of the case.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Department policies are contained in the Department of Human Service s Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Referenc e Tables Manual (RFT).

The State Disability Assistanc e (SDA) program, which provides financial ass istance for disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Fa mily Independence Agenc y) admin isters the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and Mich Admin Code, Rule 400.3151 th rough Rule 400.3180.

Additionally, verification is usually requiered at applic ation/redetermination and for a reported change affecting eligibility or ben efit level. BAM 130 (May 2012), p.1. The Department will requiest verification when information regarding an eligibility factor is unclear, inconsistent, incomplete or contradictory. The questionable information might be from the client or a thir diparty. BAM 130, p.1. To reques tiverification of information, the Department sends a Verification Check list (VCL) which is tells the client what verification is required, how to obtain it, and the due date. BAM 130, pp. 2-3. Clients are given 10 calendar days (unless otherwise specified by policy) to provide the verifications requested by the Department. Vierifications are considered to be timely if received by the date they are due. BAM 130, p.5. The Department sends a negative action noticine when the client indicates a refusal to provide a verification or the time period given has elapsed and the client has not made a reasonable effort to provide it. BAM 130, p. 5.

In this case, Claimant submitted an applic ation for SDA benefits on January 18, 2013. On January 30, 2013, the Department sent Claimant a Medical Determination VCL requesting verification of his medical records and forms relating to his alleged disability. (Exhibit 1). Claimant was required to re spond to the VCL by F ebruary 11, 2013 and provide the Department with the information requested in order for the Department to properly process the application. (Exhibit 1). The Department testified that because Claimant did not provide the Departm ent with the requested verifications by February 11, 2013 and because they did not receive any communications from Claimant indicating that he wa s having difficulty returning t he verifications by the due date, Claimant's application for SDA was denied. On February 25, 2013, the Department sent Claimant a Notice of Case Action informing him of the denial based on a failure to verify the information necessary for the Department to determine eligibility. (Exhibit 2).

Claimant testified that at the time the VCL was sent, he was staying at a homeles—s shelter and that he had his mailing address listed at his daught—er's home. Claimant confirmed that the Department—was instructed to send all of—his mail to his daughter's home address. Claimant stated that his daughter—did not inform him—that he had mail until the end of Febr uary, 2013. Claimant further testified that after receiving the VCL from his daughter, he began gat—hering the information that the Department had requested but before he could submit the ve—rifications to the Department, he was admitted to the hospit al in March, 2013. Claimant confirmed—that he did not submit the verifications by the February 11, 2013 due date.

Thus, the Department acted in accordanc e with Department policy whe n it denied Claimant's SDA a pplication for failure to provide the Department with information requested. Based upon the abov e Findings of Fact and Conclus ions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department properly denied Claimant's application improperly denied Claimant's application properly closed Claimant's case improperly closed Claimant's case for: \square AMP \square FIP \square FAP \square MA \boxtimes SDA \square CDC. **DECISION AND ORDER** The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, finds that the Department \times \text{did act properly.} did not act properly. Accordingly, the Department's AMP FIP FAP MA SDA CDC decision is \square AFFIRMED \square REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record. Lamab Raydonn

Zainab Baydoun
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director

Department of Human Services

Date Signed: August 26, 2013

Date Mailed: August 26, 2013

NOTICE OF APPE AL: Michigan Administrative Hearin g 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 dec ision cannot be implemented within 90 days of the filing of the original request (60 days for FAP cases).

The claimant may appeal the De cision and Order to Circuit Court within 30 days of the receipt of the Dec ision a nd Order or, if a tim ely 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 disc overed evidence that existed at the time of the or iginal 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 clai mant must specify all reas ons 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

ZB/las

CC:

