

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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2013-40744
Issue No.: 2018, 3019
Case No.:
Hearing Date: May 9, 2013
County: Wayne (82-43)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Jonathan W. Owens

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 May 9, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included .

ISSUE

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

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

2. On March 1, 2013, the Department
 denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's case
due to failure to complete redetermination.
3. On February 16, 2013, the Department sent
 Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)
notice of the denial. closure.
4. On April 8, 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 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, Rule 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.

In the instant case, Claimant's FAP and MA case was up for redetermination. On January 15, 2013, the Department issued a redetermination packet and notice to Claimant. The redetermination was due back by February 4, 2013. Claimant failed to complete the redetermination on or before February 4, 2013. On February 16, 2013, the Department issued a notice of case action indicating Claimant's MA benefits would end as of March 1, 2013. Claimant's FAP benefits ended without a notice due to it being the end of the FAP certification period.

Claimant testified she had moved in August 2012. Claimant testified she had contacted the Department shortly after moving in August 2012 and again in September 2012 and left voicemails indicating her new address. Claimant failed to present evidence, such as phone records, to demonstrate any calls were made to the Department. In addition, Claimant was unable to provide any dates of the calls she alleged she made to the Department. Claimant further indicated she had received some of the papers but was not sure if she received all the papers sent to her old address. Further, Claimant was unable to say when she actually obtained the papers other than she picked them up while visiting her old address.

The Department testified that, to the best of their knowledge, no calls were received indicating Claimant had moved in August 2012. The Department testified the business practice is that if a client calls and informs them of an address change, the Department will make the necessary changes. The Department indicated no mail was ever returned as undeliverable. Further, the Department questioned whether Claimant had notified the post office of her new address, because, if she had, the mail would have been forwarded.

After considering the evidence and testimony provided, this Administrative Law Judge finds the Department has presented evidence demonstrating notices and requests were sent to Claimant's last reported address. Claimant has not demonstrated she had informed the Department of her new address. Claimant's inaction does not negate the Department's demonstrated attempts to process Claimant's redetermination.

Based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department


properly denied Claimant's application improperly denied Claimant's application
 properly closed Claimant's case 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.



Jonathan W. Owens
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: May 13, 2013

Date Mailed: May 13, 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 affect the substantial rights of the claimant:
 - 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

JWO/pf

cc:

