

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2013-4448  
Issue No.: 2006  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: January 9, 2013  
County: Wayne (82-82)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Robert J. Chavez

**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 9, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Authorized Hearing Representatives (AHR) [REDACTED]. 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:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP)?  | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA)? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP)?      | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC)?  |
| <input checked="" 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  applied for  was receiving:  FIP  FAP  MA  SDA  CDC.
2. Claimant was required to submit requested verification paperwork by October 1, 2012.
3. On October 2, 2012, the Department

- denied Claimant's application.
- closed Claimant's case.
- reduced Claimant's benefits .

4. On October 2, 2012, the Department sent notice of the
  - denial of Claimant's application.
  - closure of Claimant's case.
  - reduction of Claimant's benefits.
5. On October 9, 2012, 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.

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program which provides financial assistance for disabled persons is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 1998-2000 AACS R 400.3151-400.3180.

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 1997 AACRS R 400.5001-5015.

Additionally, the evidence shows that Claimant failed to submit proper requested verification paperwork .

Claimant was properly sent a request for verification on August 30, 2012. On September 6, 2012, Claimant properly requested and received an extension. On September 20, 2012, Claimant properly requested and received a second extension. On October 2, when no verifications had been returned, the application in question was denied.

There is no dispute as to the facts in this case. Claimant argues, instead, that the Department never notified Claimant's AHRs of the second extension and, as such, should not be held accountable for failing to return requested verifications.

The Administrative Law Judge finds this argument to be without merit.

First, there is no policy that requires notification of a granted extension.

Second, by the admission of the AHRs, this is not the first time dealing with the Department. The representatives knew, or should have known, that an extension adds 10 days to the previous due date. BAM 130. An extension granted for September 20, 2012, would mean a new due date of September 30, 2012 (the Department granted the claimant one additional day, with a due date of October 1, 2012--this fact has no relevance to the analysis in this decision). If Claimant could not get verifications by that date, a new extension should have been requested.

Instead, Claimant's AHRs did not even attempt to make contact with the Department until October 2, 2012, after the proposed due date and 12 days after the requested extension. Even if they were unsure as to whether an extension had been granted, due diligence would require a good faith attempt to secure verification before September 30 or, at the very least, an attempt to make contact with the Department before that date to confirm the verification. If the representatives were unsure as to the due date, it would be the responsibility of the representatives to inquire before the proposed due date.

Regardless, the fact of the matter remains that the extension was granted and the Department received no contact from Claimant's AHRs until after a notice of case action had been issued. This is not an issue of Department error.

Therefore, as there is no evidence that Claimant failed to receive the documentation request, and as Claimant admits that the documentation request was sent and received, and given that there is no evidence that the documentation requested was returned timely, and given that the Department had an actual need for the requested documents to determine eligibility for the programs in question, the undersigned holds that the

application was properly denied. As such, the Department was correct when it denied the application in question.

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.



---

**Robert J. Chavez**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: February 5, 2013

Date Mailed: February 5, 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:

2013-4448/RJC

- 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

RJC/pf

cc:

