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

#### IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2014-21786 Issue No(s).: 2002; 3002

Case No.: Hearing Date:

February 6, 2014

County: Muskegon

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Michael S. Newell

#### **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 wa sheld on February 6, 2014, fr om Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claim ant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included

## **ISSUE**

Did the Department properly close Claimant's Medicaid on November 27, 2013, effective November 1, 2013, for failure to verify?

Did the Department properly, properly close Claimant's F AP benefits, or December 7, 2013, effective January 1, 2013 for failure to verify?

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

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

- 1. On October 6, 203, Claimant applied for SER.
- 2. On October 17, 2013, the Department mailed Claimant a Verification Check list with a due date of October 28, 2013
- 3. The Verification Checklist stated "THE STATEMENT PROVED FOR THE ACCOUNT ENDING IN 6481 WAS UNABLE TO BE USED. . . PLEASE PROVIDE A NEW STATEMENT."
- 4. Claimant did not provide a new statement by the due date.
- 5. On November 27, 2013, the Department issued a Notice of Case Action closing Claimant's Medicaid effective November 1, 2013 for failure to verify.

6. On December 7, 2 013, the Department Closed Claimant's FAP benefits effective January 1, 2013 for failure to verify.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

Department policies are contained in the Department of Human Service s Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), D epartment of Human Service es 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 W ork Opportunity Reconc iliation Act of 1996, PL 104-193, and 42 USC 601 to 679c. The Depar tment (formerly known as the Family Independenc e Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MC L 400.10 and 400.57a and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3101 to .3131.

The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp program] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 197 7, as amended, 7 USC 2011 to 2036a and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in 7 CFR 271. It 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.

Michigan adopts the mailbox rule which is a presumpti on under the common-law that letters have been received after being placed in the mail in the due course of business. *Good v Detroit Automobile Inter-Insurance Exchange*, 67 Mich App 270 (1976). In other words, the proper mailing and a ddressing of a letter creates a presumption of receipt but that presumption may be rebutted by evidence. *Stacey v Sankovich*, 19 Mi ch App 638 (1969); *Good v Detroit Aut omobile Inter-Insurance Exchange*, 67 Mi ch App 270 (1976). Under the mailbox rule, evidence e of business custom or usage is allowed to establish the fact of mailing without further testimony by an employee of compliance with the custom. *Good, supra*. Such evidence is admissible without further evidence from the records custodian that a particular letter was actually mailed. *Good supra* at 275. "Moreover, the fact that a letter was mailed with a return address but was not returned lends strength to the presumption that the letter was received." *Id* at 276. The challenging party may rebut the presumption that the letter was received by presenting evidence to the contrary. See *id*.

Additionally, the Department met its burden of proof. The Verification Checklist is presumed received under the mailbox rule, and Claimant did not rebut the presumption. Claimant offered evasive and nonresponsive testimony.

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 acted in accordance with Department policy when it closed Claimant's M edicaid on November 27, 2013, effective November 1, 2013 and close Claimant's FAP benefits, on December 7, 2013, effective January 1, 2013.

Accordingly, the Department's decision is **AFFIRMED**.

Michael S. Newell
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Michael &. Newell

Date Signed: February 14, 2014

Date Mailed: February 14, 2014

**NOTICE OF APP EAL:** The claimant may appea I the Dec ision and Order to Circuit Court within 30 days of the receipt of the Decision and Order or, i f a timely Request for Rehearing or Reconsiderati on was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the Decision and Order of Reconsideration or Rehearing Decision.

Michigan Administrative Hearing Syst em (MAHS) may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a par ty within 30 days of the mailing date of this Dec ision and Order. MAHS will not or der a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's mo tion where the final decis ion 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 disc overed evidence that existed at the time of the or iginal 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 clai mant must specify all reas ons 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

# MSN/las

