

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2013-41899
Issue No.: 1005; 2006; 3008
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: May 15, 2013
County: Wayne (17)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Susan C. Burke

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 15, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of the 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)? |
| ☒ 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. Claimant was required to submit requested verification by January 7, 2013.
3. Claimant attempted to contact the Department upon his receipt of the Verification Checklist for assistance, but Claimant's phone calls were not returned by his worker.

4. On January 15, 2013, the Department denied Claimant's FIP and MA applications.
5. On February 1, 2013, the Department closed Claimant's FAP case.
6. On January 15, 2013, the Department sent notice of the
 - ☒ denial of Claimant's application.
 - ☒ closure of Claimant's case.
 - ☐ reduction of Claimant's benefits.
7. On April 8, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the
 - ☒ denial of claimant's application.
 - ☒ closure of Claimant's case.
 - ☐ reduction of Claimant's benefits.

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 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 1997 AACS R 400.3101-3131. 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 1997 AACS R 400.3001-3015

☒ 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 (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105.

Clients must cooperate with the local DHS office in obtaining verification for determining initial and ongoing eligibility. BAM 105; BAM 130. The client should be allowed 10 calendar days to provide the verification. BAM 130. If the client refuses to provide the information or has not made a reasonable effort within the specified time period, then policy directs that a negative action be issued. *Id.*

In the present case, Claimant applied for FIP, FAP, and MA on December 28, 2012. The Department opened Claimant's FAP case and issued a Verification Checklist on

December 28, 2012. Claimant acknowledged receiving the Verification Checklist. Claimant testified credibly that he then attempted to obtain the verifications requested by the Department and contacted his Department worker by phone for assistance. Claimant's Department worker did not return his calls. Claimant then contacted the worker's supervisor, who acknowledged that it was not Claimant's fault that the verifications were not turned in to the Department by the due date. Nevertheless, Claimant was required to reapply for benefits.

I do not find that Claimant failed to cooperate as required by Department policy. Rather, Claimant made every effort to cooperate, with no assistance from his Department worker. Therefore, the Department was not correct in closing Claimant's FAP case and denying Claimant's FIP and MA applications due to Claimant's failure to provide requested information.

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 ☒ improperly

☒ closed Claimant's case.

☒ denied Claimant's application.

☐ reduced Claimant's benefits.

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 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:

1. Initiate reinstatement and reprocessing of Claimant's FIP and MA application of December 28, 2012.
2. Initiate reinstatement of Claimant's FAP case, effective February 1, 2013, if Claimant is otherwise eligible for FAP.
3. Notify Claimant in writing of the Department's determination with regard to Claimant's eligibility for FIP, MA and FAP.

4. Issue FIP and FAP supplements for any payment Claimant was entitled to receive, in accordance with Department policy.


Susan C. Burke
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: May 21, 2013

Date Mailed: May 21, 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.

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

SC/tm

cc: 





