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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2014-28386

Issue No.: 2002

Case No.:

Hearing Date: March 13, 2014 County: SSPC-West

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Kathleen H. Svoboda

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 Representative (AHR), Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Eligibility Specialist (ES),

The undersigned Supervising Administrative Law Judge, having reviewed the entire record in this matter including the audio recording of the March 13, 2014 telephone hearing, the official papers filed in this matter in the form of pleadings, and the exhibits that were entered generates this Hearing Decision in the absence of the presiding Administrative Law Judge.

ISSUE

Did the Department properly close Claimant's case 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. On January 8, 2014, Claimant applied for MA assistance, stating on her application that she was pregnant.
- 2. On January 9, 2014, Claimant's application was denied in error.
- MA benefits were approved pending a completed Verification Check List that was due on February 24, 2014.

4. 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's AHR did not contest that the Claimant did not return the required verification. The Claimant's AHR testified that she and the Claimant had questions regarding completing the self-employment verification form because the Claimant was no longer self-employed. The Claimant's AHR testified that she telephoned the Claimant's ES several times to ask her questions and she received no return phone call. Indeed, the Claimant's AHR testified that she not only left messages for the Claimant's ES, but she also left messages for the local Department's ES present at the hearing was not the worker who took action in the Claimant's case. She could therefore not address any of the Claimant's AHR's assertions because she testified that she had no personal knowledge of whether the worker who took the action ever received the telephone calls or messages.

Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 130 pp. 2, 3, provides that the Department worker tell the Claimant what verification is required, how to obtain it and the due date by using a DHS-3503, Verification Checklist to request verification. In this case, the Department did just that. The Claimant must obtain required verification, but the Department's worker must assist if they need and request help. If neither the Claimant nor the Department's worker can obtain verification despite a reasonable effort, the Department's worker is to use the best available information. BAM 130 (2012) p. 5, provides that verifications are considered to be timely if received by the date they are due. It instructs Department workers to send a negative action notice when the Claimant indicates a refusal to provide a verification, or when the time period given has elapsed and the Claimant 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 that the Claimant was making a reasonable effort to provide the verification by telephoning the Department's ES to inquire what would be acceptable verification of self-employment, (i.e., is it appropriate for the Claimant to complete the self-employment verification form herself?) Departmental policy requires that, if the Claimant's AHR needs and request assistance, the Department personnel are required to provide help. If the Claimant's AHR's messages are not returned, the Department is then unaware of the Claimant's AHR's need for assistance and can then likely not provide such assistance.

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 did not act in accordance with Department policy when it took action to deny Claimant' MA benefits.

DECISION AND ORDER

Accordingly, the Department's decision is **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. Re-register and reprocess Claimant's application for MA benefits.
- 2. Reinstate Claimant's MA benefits pending the determination as to eligibility after the application is processed.
- 2. Issue the Claimant any supplement that may be determined due and owing her if found eligible for MA benefits.

Kathleen H. Svoboda Supervising Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 4/14/14

Date Mailed: 4/21/14

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

KHS/tb

CC:

