

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2013-47325
Issue No.: 3008
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: June 19, 2013
County: SSPC WEST

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 June 19, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included Assistance Payments Worker, [REDACTED] [REDACTED].

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 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 type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA). | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC). |

2. On May 1, 2013, the Department

denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's case due to his failure to submit the requested verification.

3. On May 3, 2013, the Department sent
 Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)
notice of the denial. closure.
4. On May 10, 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.

Though there was no documentary evidence of such in the hearing packet at the hearing, the Department testified that the Claimant reapplied for FAP benefits on May 3, 2013 and has been issued FAP benefits for May. The Claimant contested that statement during the hearing. After the hearing, a more complete hearing packet was brought to the Administrative Law Judge containing additional pages that were not admitted into evidence and they are marked P13 and P14. Those documents were not considered in this decision.

In this case, the verification that the Claimant submitted to the Department was unacceptable to the Department because the Claimant provided no pay stub and the DHS-38, Verification of Employment was not signed by the employer, nor was it specific, though it did indicate that the Claimant's employment was expected to end on March 21, 2013. The Claimant testified that he had no pay stubs because his pay was direct deposited into his account. The Claimant testified that he did call the Department worker at one point to tell her that he was waiting on documents from his employer. The Claimant stated that he is no longer welcome at his previous job and he had a friend take the DHS-38, Verification of Employment form into his previous supervisor to complete and that his supervisor did that. The Claimant testified that he had no pay stubs and when he asked his employer for them he was told he had to go through the bank to obtain them. He does not have a car.

Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 200 (2012) p. 4 instructs Departmental workers to not deny or terminate assistance because an employer or other source refuses to verify income. Bridges Assistance Manual (BAM) 130 (2012) p. 3 provides that the client must obtain required verification, but the Department worker must assist if they need and request help. In this case, the Claimant did not request help, but did telephone the Department's worker to say that he was waiting on documents from his employer. BAM 130 (2012) p. 2 does provide that the worker can make a collateral contact. BAM 130 (2012) p. 6 provides that the Department's worker give the Claimant an opportunity to resolve any discrepancy between his statements and information from another source. BAM 130 p. 5 provides that verifications are considered to be timely if received by the date they are due. BAM 130 p. 5 instructs Department workers to send a negative action notice when the client indicates refusal to provide a verification, or when the time period given has elapsed and the client has not made a reasonable effort to provide it. In this case, the Administrative Law Judge determines that the time period to submit the verification had lapsed, but the Claimant in this case had made a reasonable effort to provide the verification, though the verification was lacking.

In this case, the Administrative Law Judge determines that the Claimant's worker could have telephoned the employer to resolve any discrepancy about what the Claimant's income was/is and to confirm the employment end date. In the alternative, the Department's worker could have also issued another DHS-3503, Verification Checklist informing the Claimant that the DHS-38, Verification of Employment was insufficient and notifying him that his pay stubs were still required to prevent closure of the case.

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 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**.

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

1. Redetermine the Claimant's eligibility for FAP back to the application date, and
2. Issue the Claimant any supplement he may thereafter be due.

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

Date Signed: June 21, 2013

Date Mailed: June 24, 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.

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/las

cc:

