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

IN THE MATTER OF:

		l

Reg. No.: 2014-20592

Issue No.: 2004

Case No.:

Hearing Date:

February 6, 2014

County: Ingham

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Susanne E. Harris

HEARING DECISION

Following Claimant's request for a hearing, this matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and 400.37; 7 CFR 273.15 to 273.18; 42 CFR 431.200 to 431.250; 45 CFR 99.1 to 99.33; and 45 CFR 205.10. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on February 6, 2014, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Authorized Hearing Representative, Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Eligibility Specialist,

<u>ISSUE</u>

Did the Department properly process the Claimant's application for Medical Assistance (MA)?

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

- 1. The Claimant is an on-going recipient of monthly FAP benefits. The Claimant's FAP case number is
- On February 7, 2012, and the filed an application for MA and for retro-MA on behalf of the Claimant. The Department did not receive this application until May 23, 2012.
- 3. On September 30, 2013, the Department sent the Claimant a DHS-1605, Notice of Case Action informing the Claimant that his application for MA had been denied for the time period December 1, 2012 on-going. The DHS-1605, Notice of Case Action contained the case number . The Department's Eligibility Specialist testified that the case number on the DHS-1605, Notice of Case Action should have been and it also should have covered the time period from February 2012 on-going.

4. On December 11, 2013, the Department received the Claimant's AHR's written hearing request. During the hearing, the Claimant's AHR clarified that the issue with the AHR was protesting was that the Department did not issue the AHR a proper DHS-1605, Notice of Case Action.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Department policies are contained in the Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), Department of Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT), and Department of Human Services Emergency Relief Manual (ERM). The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, PL 104-193, and 42 USC 601 to 679c. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10 and 400.57a and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3101 to .3131. The Food Assistance Program (FAP) Iformerly known as the Food Stamp program is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, 7 USC 2011 to 2036a and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in 7 CFR 271.1 to 285.5. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10 and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001 to .3015. The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social Security Act, 42 USC 1396-1396w-5, and is implemented by 42 CFR 400.200 to The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10 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. The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program is established by the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1-.119b. The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10 and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3151-.3180. The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE and XX of the Social Security Act, 42 USC 601-619, 670-679c, and 1397-1397m-5; the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 1990, PL 101-508, 42 USC 9858 to 9858g; and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, PL 104-193. The program is implemented by 45 CFR 98.1-99.33. The Department administers the program pursuant to MCL 400.10 and provides services to adults and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and Mich Admin Code, R 400.5001-.5020.

☐ The State Emergency Relief (SER) program is established by the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1119b. The SER program is administered by the Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) pursuant to MCL 400.10 and by Mich Admin Code, R 400.7001 through R 400.7049.
☐ Direct Support Services (DSS) is established by the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1119b. The program is administered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10 and 400.57a and Mich Admin Code R 400.3603.
☐ The State SSI Payments (SSP) program is established by 20 CFR 416.20012099 and the Social Security Act, 42 USC 1382e. The Department administers the program pursuant to MCL 400.10.

In this case, the Claimant's AHR did not contest the determination of the MRT. It is also not contested that the DHS-1605, Notice of Case Action is defective. It does not address at least 10 months of potential eligibility that the Claimant's AHR applied for. Furthermore, the notice does not contain the correct case number. The Claimant's AHR testified that he needs a proper DHS-1605, Notice of Case Action to present to another organization to possibly obtain assistance. The Department Eligibility Specialist at the hearing conceded that the Claimant's AHR should have a proper DHS-1605, Notice of Case Action; however, she also testified that the Bridges computer system is simply not recognizing the case number assigned to the Claimant's MA application.

Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 115 (2013) p. 18, provides that when an eligibility decision is reached, the Department's Eligibility Specialist certify the denial. The Bridges computer system is then to send a DHS-1605, Notice of Case Action to the Claimant's AHR. As the DHS-1605 is to be a notice of what actually happened in the case, this Administrative Law Judge concludes that the policy infers that the notice be an accurate reflection of what actually happened in the case. It is not contested that in this case the DHS-1605, Notice of Case Action is defective. As such, This Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department was not acting in accordance with its policy when it processed the Claimant's application.

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, if any, finds that the Department \boxtimes did not act in accordance with Department policy when it processed the Claimant's application.

DECISION AND ORDER

Accordingly, the Department's decision is \boxtimes **REVERSED**.

- ☑ THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO BEGIN DOING THE FOLLOWING, IN ACCORDANCE WITH DEPARTMENT POLICY AND CONSISTENT WITH THIS HEARING DECISION, WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER:
- 1. Issue to the Claimant's AHR a DHS-1605, Notice of Case Action which accurately reflects the Department's determination regarding the application the Department received on May 23, 2012. This DHS-1605, Notice of Case Action should also reflect the proper case number.

Susanne E Hanis

Susanne E. Harris Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 2/11/14

Date Mailed: 2/12/14

NOTICE OF APPEAL: 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 or Reconsideration was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the Decision and Order of Reconsideration or Rehearing Decision.

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).

A Request for Rehearing or Reconsideration may be granted when one of the following exists:

- Newly discovered evidence that existed at the time of the original hearing that could affect the outcome of the original hearing decision;
- Misapplication of manual policy or law in the hearing decision which led to a wrong conclusion;
- Typographical, mathematical or other obvious error in the hearing decision that affects the rights of the client;
- Failure of the ALJ to address in the hearing decision relevant issues raised in the hearing request.

The Department, AHR or the Claimant must specify all reasons for the request. MAHS will not review any response to a request for rehearing/reconsideration. A request must be *received* in MAHS within 30 days of the date the hearing decision is mailed.

The written request must be faxed to (517) 335-6088 and be labeled as follows:

Attention: MAHS Rehearing/Reconsideration Request

If submitted by mail, the written request must be addressed as follows:

Michigan Administrative Hearings Reconsideration/Rehearing Request P.O. Box 30639 Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

SEH/tb

