


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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**



Reg. No.: 2013-15556  
Issue No.: 3008  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: January 16, 2013  
County: DHS-SSPC-WEST

**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 January 16, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED] Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [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:

- Family Independence Program (FIP)?  State Disability Assistance (SDA)?  
 Food Assistance Program (FAP)?  Child Development and Care (CDC)?  
 Adult Medical Program (AMP)?

**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  AMP  SDA  CDC.
2. On September 11, 2012, the Claimant  was  was not provided with a verification checklist by P. Luben.
3. On October 12, 2012, the Claimant was provided a verification checklist by Ms. Modest.

4. On October 22, 2012, the Claimant faxed to the Department the verifications requested.
5. On October 29, 2012, the Department denied the Claimant's FAP application for failing to return requested verifications.
6. On October 29, 2012, the Department sent notice of the
  - denial of Claimant's application.
  - closure of Claimant's case.
  - reduction of Claimant's benefits.
7. On November 7, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the
  - denial.  closure.  reduction.

### **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 (FS) 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 MC L 400.10, *et seq.*, and 1999 AC, R 400.3001 through Rule 400.3015.

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.

The client might be unable to answer a question about himself or another person whose circumstances must be known. Allow the client at least 10 days (or other timeframe specified in policy) to obtain the needed information.

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>

The Claimant received two different verification checklists. The one the Claimant faxed to the Department as alleged happened to be a check list from an earlier

---

<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).

date and was not the one in question. The checklist information on the Claimant submitted was past due as it pertained to the verification checklist it applied to, but if the information was current, it would have satisfied the second verification checklist. Perhaps the Claimant attached the wrong checklist but provided the correct information. I don't know. What complicates matters even more is the Department's witness was also confused about entries in the comments log and couldn't clearly explain the events that transpired in the Claimant's case. For this reason, I find that more likely than not, the Claimant submitted the correct information but attached the wrong verification checklist and it was thereafter lost or misplaced at the Department level.

Accordingly, I find evidence to **REVERSE** the Department 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, find 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 of the Claimant's eligibility for FAP benefits beginning September 27, 2012 and issue retroactive benefits if otherwise eligible and qualified.

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

Date Signed: January 17, 2013

Date Mailed: January 17, 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:

