

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2013-13177  
Issue No.: 3008  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: February 7, 2013  
County: Saginaw 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 February 7, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].

**ISSUE**

Due to a failure to comply with the verification requirements, did the Department properly  deny Claimant's application  close Claimant's case  reduce Claimant's benefits 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)?                  |   |

**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  was receiving:  FIP  FAP  MA  SDA  CDC.
2. On September 11, 2012, the Claimant  was  was not provided with a redetermination packet (DHS-1010). The redetermination packet was due October 11, 2012.
3. On September 18, 2012, the Claimant returned to the Department a completed redetermination packet.

4. According to the redetermination packet, the Claimant was supposed to participate in a telephone interview on October 11, 2012.
5. On October 11, 2012, the Department failed to contact the Claimant at the number provided in the redetermination packet.
6. Between October 12, 2012 and approximately November 5, 2012, the Claimant and the Department exchanged phone calls but never rescheduled or participated in a phone interview.
7. On approximately November 1, 2012, the Department closed the Claimant's FAP case due to the Claimant failing to participate in a telephone interview.
8. On November 19, 2012, the Claimant requested a hearing.

### **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 FAP [formerly known as the Food Stamp (F S) 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, R 400.3001 through Rule 400.3015.

The Department of Human Services must periodically redetermine an individual's eligibility. The redetermination process includes thorough review of all eligibility factors.

Clients must cooperate with the local office in determining initial and ongoing eligibility. This includes completion of necessary forms. Clients must completely and truthfully answer all questions on forms and in interviews.

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 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>

---

<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).

I have carefully considered and weighed the testimony and other evidence in the record and find the Claimant's witness's testimony, to be persuasive. The arguments were substantiated by telephone records that I found to be both credible and thorough. Based on those records, I could not find any phone calls placed by the Department to the Claimant on the date of the interview at or around the time of the interview. Therefore, I do not find the Department attempted to call the Claimant for the interview as alleged.

Additionally, I found the Department's lack of attention to detail surrounding the notice of case action and specific dates as related to the notice discouraging. It caused me to seriously question the veracity of the Department's testimony.

Accordingly, I find, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence presented during the hearing, the department did not act in accordance with the applicable laws and policies in closing the Claimant's FAP case.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

I find based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, 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 FAP benefits beginning November 1, 2012 and issue retroactive benefits if otherwise qualified and eligible.

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

Date Signed: February 8, 2013

Date Mailed: February 8, 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 receipt 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 **MAY** 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 effect the substantial rights of the claimant:
  - the 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

CAA/las

cc:

