

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 201328416
Issue No.: 1038
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: March 6, 2013
County: Washtenaw

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Susanne E. Harris

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 March 6, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included Family Independence Manager (FIM) [REDACTED] and PATH Co-ordinator, [REDACTED].

ISSUE

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

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

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 applied for benefits received benefits for:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP). | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP). |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP). | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA). |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA). | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC). |

2. On February 1, 2013, the Department denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's case due to her non-compliance with employment related activities.

3. On January 8, 2013, the Department sent
 Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)
notice of the denial. closure.
4. On February 5, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the
 denial of the application. closure of the case.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

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

The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 42 USC 601, *et seq.* The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 1999 AC, R 400.3101 through Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996.

The Food Assistance Program (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 MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 1999 AC, R 400.3001 through Rule 400.3015.

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, 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, *et seq.*

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 2000 AACS, R 400.3151 through Rule 400.3180.

The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE and XX of the Social Security Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 1990, and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. The program is implemented by Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 98 and 99. The Department provides services to adults and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and 1999 AC, R 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.

In this case, the Claimant did not contest that she missed the appointment scheduled for January 2, 2013 and that she also did not attend the triage appointment scheduled for January 14, 2013. Indeed, the Claimant, during most of the hearing, kept questioning the Department staff and Administrative Law Judge as to why she should attend when she had submitted a DHS 54-E indicating "no work for now," and that this was expected to last beyond 90 days. (This document was faxed directly after the hearing and admitted as Claimant's Exhibit A) The Claimant stated that she would be approved for SSA Disability any day now.

The Claimant also testified that she could not get one of her case workers on the telephone and that sometimes she had to drive to her local office just to speak with her because she would sometimes get notices that her case was going to close. The Claimant testified that she takes [REDACTED] per month and, as she could not tolerate [REDACTED] she is on a [REDACTED]. Toward the end of the hearing, the Claimant contested ever receiving the DHS, 2444 Notice of Non-compliance as well as the notice of the January 2, 2013 appointment. The Claimant confirmed that, at all times relevant to this case, her address has remained the same.

The proper mailing and addressing of a letter creates a presumption of receipt. That presumption may be rebutted by evidence. *Stacey v Sankovich*, 19 Mich App 638 (1969); *Good v Detroit Automobile Inter-Insurance Exchange*, 67 Mich App 270 (1976). Furthermore, the Claimant's testimony that she did not receive the notices is found to be less than credible, as she never raised that claim until after she had testified repeatedly that she did not think she had to attend the appointments that the notices referenced. The evidence does not at all rebut the presumption that the Claimant received the notices the Department sent.

Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 233A (2013) p. 2 provides that failing to appear for a scheduled appointment constitutes non-compliance with employment related activities. It is not contested that the Claimant did not appear at the January 2, 2013 appointment. BEM 233A p. 7 provides that the Department shall not terminate the Claimant's case without providing an opportunity for the Claimant to establish good cause and the Department in this case did send the Claimant notice of her good cause/triage appointment on the DHS, 2444, Notice of Non-compliance which scheduled that meeting for January 14, 2013. It is not contested that the Claimant also failed to appear or even telephone for that meeting. The policy instructs that the Department make the good cause determination in the Claimant's absence if she fails to appear. Therefore, the Department determined that the Claimant had no good cause for her non-compliance. It is not contested that this is the Claimant's second instance of non-compliance and as such, BEM 233A p. 6 provides that the Claimant's FIP case be closed for not less than six months.

Based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law the Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> properly denied Claimant's application | <input type="checkbox"/> improperly denied Claimant's application |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> properly closed Claimant's case | <input type="checkbox"/> improperly closed Claimant's case |

for: AMP FIP FAP MA SDA CDC.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, finds that the Department did act properly. did not act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's AMP FIP FAP MA SDA CDC decision is **AFFIRMED** REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.

THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO DO THE FOLLOWING WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER:

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

Date Signed: March 18, 2013

Date Mailed: March 20, 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 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)

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.

201328416/SEH

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

SEH/tb

cc:

