

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 201365447
Issue No.: 3008
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: October 29, 2013
County: SSPC-West

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: C. Adam Purnell

HEARING DECISION

Following Claimant's request for a hearing, this matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and 400.37; 7 CFR 273.15 to 273.18; 42 CFR 431.200 to 431.250; 45 CFR 99.1 to 99.33; and 45 CFR 205.10. After due notice, a three-way telephone hearing was held on October 29, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED] (Claimant). Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED] (Eligibility Specialist).

ISSUE

Due to a failure to comply with the verification requirements, did the Department properly deny Claimant's application for Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits?

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

1. Claimant applied for FAP benefits.
2. Claimant was required to submit requested verification by July 5, 2013.
3. On July 8, 2013, the Department denied Claimant's application.
4. On July 8, 2013, the Department sent Claimant notice of its action.
5. On August 22, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the Department's action.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Department policies are contained in the Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and Department of Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp program] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, 7 USC 2011 to 2036a and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in 7 CFR 271.1 to 285.5. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10 and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001 to .3015.

Verification is usually required upon application or redetermination and for a reported change affecting eligibility or benefit level. BAM 130. Verification means documentation or other evidence to establish the accuracy of the client's verbal or written statements. BAM 130. Verifications are considered timely if received by the date they are due. BAM 130.

For FAP, the department must allow a client 10 calendar days (or other time limit specified in policy) to provide the requested verification. BAM 130. Should the client indicate a refusal to provide a verification or, conversely, if the time period given has elapsed and the client has not made a reasonable effort to provide it, the department may send the client a negative action notice. BAM 130.

The Department sometimes will utilize a verification checklist (VCL) or a DHS form telling clients what is needed to determine or redetermine eligibility. See Bridges Program Glossary (BPG) at page 47. For FAP only, if the client contacts the department prior to the due date requesting an extension or assistance in obtaining verifications, the department must assist them with the verifications but not grant an extension. BAM 130. The department worker must explain to the client they will not be given an extension and their case will be denied once the VCL due date is passed. BAM 130. Also, the department worker shall explain their eligibility will be determined based on their compliance date if they return required verifications. BAM 130. The department must re-register the application if the client complies within 60 days of the application date. See BAM 115 & BAM 130.

Generally speaking, the client is obligated to obtain required verification, but the department worker must assist if the client needs and requests help. BAM 130. If neither the client nor the department worker can obtain verification despite a reasonable effort, the department worker must use the best available information. BAM 130. If no evidence is available, the department worker should use his or her best judgment. BAM 130.

Here, the Department asserts that Claimant's FAP application was denied because she failed to return all requested verifications within the required time period. The Department mailed Claimant a verification checklist which sought self-employment

verifications, savings/checking account information, donations/contributions from Claimant's mother, and home rent. Claimant, on the other hand, contends that she received the Department's verification checklist after she received the notice of case action informing her that her FAP application was denied. Claimant also stated that she was generally confused about the verification documents and the entire application process.

Testimony and other evidence must be weighed and considered according to its reasonableness. *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). The weight and credibility of this evidence is generally for the fact-finder to determine. *Dep't of Community Health*, 274 Mich App at 372; *People v Terry*, 224 Mich App 447, 452; 569 NW2d 641 (1997). Moreover, it is for the fact-finder to gauge the demeanor and veracity of the witnesses who appear before him, as best he is able. See, e.g., *Caldwell v Fox*, 394 Mich 401, 407; 231 NW2d 46 (1975); *Zeeland Farm Services, Inc v JBL Enterprises, Inc*, 219 Mich App 190, 195; 555 NW2d 733 (1996).

This Administrative Law Judge has carefully considered and weighed the testimony and other evidence in the record. Claimant contends and the record appears to show that the Department may have mailed the June 25, 2013 verification checklist (which requested verifications by July 5, 2013) on or after July 8, 2013. Similarly, the record also appears to show that the Department mailed the notice of case action on July 8, 2013. The Department worker who attended the hearing was unable to provide evidence to contradict this. This Administrative Law Judge finds that Claimant's confusion in this regard is understandable. However, the Department worker pointed out that Claimant failed to return all requested verifications within 60 days of the application. The notice of case action clearly provides that if she provides verifications after the 60 days, she will need to re-apply. Claimant admitted that she did not return all verifications within the 60 days.

Based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence presented during the hearing, this Administrative Law Judge finds that the Department acted properly when it denied the FAP application. Here, Claimant has failed to make a reasonable effort to provide all requested verifications within the 60 day time period.

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, if any, finds that the Department acted in accordance with Department policy when it denied the FAP application.

DECISION AND ORDER

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

/s/

C. Adam Purnell
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: October 29, 2013

Date Mailed: October 30, 2013

NOTICE OF APPEAL: 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.

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).

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

201365447/CAP

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

CAP/aca

cc:

