

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No: 2013-15962  
Issue No: 3008  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: January 16, 2013  
Kent 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 January 16, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [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 was receiving FAP benefits.
2. On October 1, 2012, the Department sent the Claimant a semi-annual review.
3. On November 5, 2012, the Claimant returned the semi-annual review.
4. On November 5, 2012, the Department sent the Claimant a verification checklist. The checklist was due November 15, 2012.

5. On November 8, 2012, the Department sent the Claimant an additional verification checklist. The second checklist was due November 19, 2012.
6. As of November 30, 2012, the Claimant had not returned a single verification.
7. On November 30, 2012, the Department sent the Claimant a notice of case action. The notice indicated the Claimant's FAP benefits were closing December 1, 2012.
8. On December 6, 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.

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>

I have carefully considered and weighed the testimony and other evidence in the record and find the Claimant did not return the requested verifications as she alleged. The

---

<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).

Claimant first alleged she turned the documentation in but could not specifically recall a date. Later the Claimant recanted and testified she could recall a specific date, but before providing a specific date, indicated an Employer submitted the verifications albeit submitted them past the due date. The Claimant's reasoning as to why they were submitted late does not amount to good cause.

Accordingly, I **AFFIRM** the Department's actions 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, the Department did act properly.

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

/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,

2013-15962/CAA

- 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:

