

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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2014-5878
Issue No.: 3008; 2001
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: November 19, 2013
County: SSPC-WEST

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Susanne E. Harris

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 telephone hearing was held on November 19, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Eligibility Specialist (ES), [REDACTED].

ISSUES

Did the Department properly deny Claimant's application close Claimant's case for:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA)? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC)? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Direct Support Services (DSS)? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> State SSI Payments (SSP)? |

Did the Department properly deny Claimant's application close Claimant's case for:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA)? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC)? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Direct Support Services (DSS)? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> State SSI Payments (SSP)? |

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. Claimant received: FIP FAP MA AMP SDA
 CDC DSS SSP benefits.

2. Claimant applied for: FIP FAP MA AMP SDA
 CDC DSS SSP benefits.
3. On August 16, 2013, the Department denied Claimant's MA application. Because the Claimant was not categorically eligible for MA and AMP is currently closed to new enrollments. On August 16, 2013, the Department sent Claimant its decision.
4. On September 1, 2013, the Department closed Claimant's FAP case due to Claimant's failure to verify his [REDACTED]. On September 4, 2013, the Department sent Claimant its decision.
5. On October 8, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the Department's actions.

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 Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, PL 104-193, and 42 USC 601 to 679c. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10 and 400.57a and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3101 to .3131.

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.

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social Security Act, 42 USC 1396-1396w-5, and is implemented by 42 CFR 400.200 to 1008.59. The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10 and MCL 400.105.

The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315 and is administered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10.

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program is established by the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1-.119b. The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10 and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3151-.3180.

The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE and XX of the Social Security Act, 42 USC 601-619, 670-679c, and 1397-1397m-5; the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 1990, PL 101-508, 42 USC 9858 to 9858q; and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, PL 104-193. The program is implemented by 45 CFR 98.1-99.33. The Department administers the program pursuant to MCL 400.10 and provides services to adults and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and Mich Admin Code, R 400.5001-.5020.

Direct Support Services (DSS) is established by the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1-.119b. The program is administered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10 and 400.57a and Mich Admin Code R 400.3603.

The State SSI Payments (SSP) program is established by 20 CFR 416.2001-.2099 and the Social Security Act, 42 USC 1382e. The Department administers the program pursuant to MCL 400.10.

Additionally, Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 105 (2013) p. 1, provides that MA is comprised of several eligibility categories. Claimants may be eligible for MA if the Claimant is blind, disabled, over 65 or under 21, pregnant or a caretaker of minor children. The uncontested fact in this case is that the Claimant did not fit into any of the above listed eligibility categories.

BEM 640 (2013) p. 1, provides that applications received during the freeze on AMP enrollments must be registered and denied using “applicant did not meet other eligibility requirements” as the denial reason. Applicants must be informed that the reason for denial is an enrollment freeze. The DHS-1605, Notice of Case Action in evidence informs the Claimant that the denial for MA is because he did not meet other eligibility requirements and that the denial for AMP is due to an enrollment freeze at this time. Therefore, the Administrative Law Judge determines that the Department was acting in accordance with its policy when it took action to deny the Claimant’s application for MA/AMP.

Regarding the Claimant’s FAP case, it is not contested that the Claimant did submit a list of transactions from his [REDACTED]. The ES at the hearing argued that what the Claimant submitted was not a reasonable effort at complying with the verification request, as the list of transactions was not current. The list described transactions from December 15, 2010 to October 31, 2011. The Claimant’s [REDACTED] testified that this is because there has been no activity since [REDACTED] and she also pointed out that the document was downloaded on August 28, 2013 and it is therefore recent. The Claimant’s [REDACTED] testified that the first page of the document apparently did not make it with the remainder of the document when it was faxed.

Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 130 pp. 2, 3, provides that the Department worker tell the Claimant what verification is required, how to obtain it and the due date by using a DHS-3503, Verification Checklist to request verification. In this case, the Department did just that. BAM 130 (2012) p. 5, provides that verifications are considered to be timely if received by the date they are due. It instructs Department workers to send a negative action notice when the client indicates a refusal to provide a verification, or

when the time period given has elapsed and the client has not made a reasonable effort to provide it. In this case, the Administrative Law Judge determines that the time period to submit the verification had lapsed. However, based on the testimony of the Claimant's [REDACTED] the Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Claimant did make a reasonable effort to provide the verification, though the verification was unacceptable to the ES. As such, the Administrative Law Judge determines that the Department was not acting in accordance with its policy when taking action to close the Claimant's FAP case.

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon 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 took action to deny the Claimant's MA application. did not act in accordance with Department policy when it took action to close the Claimant's FAP case.

DECISION AND ORDER

Accordingly, the Department's decision is AFFIRMED IN PART with respect to the MA application and REVERSED IN PART with respect to the Claimant's FAP case.

THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO BEGIN DOING THE FOLLOWING, IN ACCORDANCE WITH DEPARTMENT POLICY AND CONSISTENT WITH THIS HEARING DECISION, WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER:

1. Re-determine the Claimant's eligibility for FAP back to September 1, 2013, and
2. Issue the Claimant any supplement he may thereafter be due.

/s/
Susanne E. Harris
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 11/22/13

Date Mailed: 11/26/13

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

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

SEH/tb

cc:

