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

ı	N	П	П			٨	A I	۸.	г	ΓΕ	)			
	IV			п	_	- 11	11 /	•				u	•	_

form.

IN I	HE MATTER OF:							
		Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	2014-24725 2002 March 13, 2014 Bay					
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 March 13, 2014, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Eligibility Specialist (ES),								
<u>ISSUE</u>								
Did the Department properly ⊠ close Claimant's case for:								
☐ F	Family Independence Program (FIP)?  Food Assistance Program (FAP)?  Medical Assistance (MA)?  Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)?  State Disability Assistance (SDA)?  Child Development and Care (CDC)  Direct Support Services (DSS)?  State SSI Payments (SSP)?							
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 ⊠ received: ⊠ MA benefits.							
2.	On February 1, 2014, the Department 🛛 closed Claimant's case due to the Claimant's failure to submit the required, completed DHS-1010, Redetermination							

3. On January 18, 2014, the Department sent Claimant its decision. 4. On January 28, 2014, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the Department's actions.

## **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), and Department of Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

☐ 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 1008.59. 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.

In this case, the Claimant testified that her address has remained the same at all times relevant to these proceedings. The Claimant testified that she received all documents sent to her by the Department, but for the DHS-1010, Redetermination form (Exhibit 1). The Claimant testified that she was not sure why she did not get the DHS-1010, Redetermination form.

The proper mailing and addressing of a letter creates a presumption of receipt. That presumption may be rebutted by evidence. *Stacey v Sankovich*, 19 Mich App 638 (1969); *Good v Detroit Automobile Inter-Insurance Exchange*, 67 Mich App 270 (1976). In this case, the Administrative Law Judge determines that the evidence is insufficient to rebut the presumption that the Claimant received the DHS-1010, Redetermination form. This is particularly so because the Claimant received all other documents sent to her by the Department and she has resided at the same address during all times relevant to these proceedings.

Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 210 (2013) p. 1, provides that the DHS must periodically re-determine an individual's eligibility for active programs and such redetermination process includes thorough review of all eligibility factors. BAM 210 p. 2, provides that benefits stop at the end of the benefit period unless a redetermination is completed and a new benefit period is certified. In this case, it was not contested that the Department did not receive a completed DHS-1010, Redetermination form. Because the Department did not receive the required information, a Notice of Case Action was generated and sent on January 18, 2014 (Exhibit 2) advising Claimant that benefits were closing for failure to return the Redetermination form. The Administrative Law Judge concludes that the evidence indicates that the Claimant received the DHS-1010, Redetermination form. Because the completed form was not returned to the Department, the redetermination was not completed and the Claimant's benefits stopped at the end of her benefit period. BAM 220 requires timely notice be provided prior to termination of benefits. In this case, the Department sent a Notice of Case Action (DHS-1605) and acted in accordance with policy.

As such, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department has met its burden of establishing that it was acting in accordance with policy when taking action to close the Claimant's case for failure to submit the required DHS-1010, Redetermination form.

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon 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 took action to close the Claimant's MA case.

## **DECISION AND ORDER**

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

Susanne E. Harris Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director

Department of Human Services

Susanne E Hanis

Date Signed: 3/21/14

Date Mailed: 3/24/14

**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 Claimant;

 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

cc: