

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2014-33707  
Issue No.: 2001  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: April 29, 2014  
County: Macomb (20)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** C. Adam Purnell

**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 April 29, 2014 from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED] (Claimant) and [REDACTED] (Claimant's daughter). Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED] (Hearing Facilitator).

**ISSUES**

Did the Department receive Claimant's request for hearing within 90 days of the mailing of the notice of case action?

Did the Department properly determine Claimant's Medical Assistance (MA) eligibility?

**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's group member daughter was active for MA.
2. On December 7, 2013, the Department mailed Claimant a Notice of Case Action (DHS-1605) which denied MA for Victoria Gaines effective December 1, 2013 ongoing due to failure to cooperate with child support requirements.
3. On January 31, 2014, the Department mailed Claimant a Notice of Case Action (DHS-1605).
4. On March 24, 2014, Claimant requested a hearing concerning her MA case.

## **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).

There are two issues in the instant matter. The first question concerns whether Claimant timely requested a hearing and the second is whether the Department properly determined Claimant's eligibility for MA.

### **Timeliness of Request for Hearing**

Regulations governing the hearing and appeal process for applicants and recipients of public assistance in Michigan are found in Mich Admin Code, R 400.901 through R 400.951. Rule 400.903(1) provides as follows:

An opportunity for a hearing shall be granted to an applicant who requests a hearing because [a] claim for assistance is denied or is not acted upon with reasonable promptness, and to any recipient who is aggrieved by a Department action resulting in suspension, reduction, discontinuance, or termination of assistance.

A request for hearing must be in writing and signed by the claimant, petitioner, or authorized representative. Rule 400.904(1). Moreover, the Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 600 (3-1-2014), p. 5, provides in relevant part as follows:

The client or authorized hearing representative has *90 calendar days from the date of the written notice of case action to request a hearing*. The request must be received anywhere in DHS within the 90 days. [Emphasis added.]

In the present case, Claimant requested a hearing using the DHS-18 portion of the Department's Notice of Case Action (DHS-1605) dated January 31, 2014. The Department contends that Claimant's request for hearing is untimely because she did not request the hearing within 90 days of the December 7, 2013 notice of case action. According to the Department, Claimant had until March 7, 2014 to request a hearing. But Claimant did not challenge the Department's December 7, 2013 notice of case action. BAM 600, p 5 (cited above) provides that Claimant has 90 calendar days from the date of the written notice of case action to request a hearing. Because Claimant used the January 31, 2014 notice of case action to request a hearing, she had until April 30, 2014. Claimant's request for hearing was timely as it was received on March 24, 2013.

### **Medical Assistance (MA) eligibility**

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.

For all programs, the Department must assure that clients receive the services and assistance for which they are eligible. Concerns expressed in the hearing request should be resolved whenever possible through a conference with the client or AHR rather than through a hearing. BAM 600, (3-1-2014) p 16.

A DHS-1560, Prehearing Conference Notice, **must** be generated and mailed to the client and AHR upon receipt of a hearing request, unless the issue in dispute pertains solely to an MRT decision. BAM 600, (3-1-2014) p 16.

A meaningful prehearing conference must be scheduled for the 11th day from the date DHS receives the request for hearing, unless the client and AHR chooses not to attend the prehearing conference. A meaningful prehearing conference includes at a minimum, performing all of the following: (1) determine why the client or AHR is disputing the DHS action; (2) review any documentation the client or AHR has to support his/her allegation; and (3) explain the department's position and identify and discuss the differences. BAM 600, (3-1-2014) p 16.

If the dispute cannot be resolved, [the Department worker] must do the following: (1) provide the client and AHR a copy of the DHS-3050, Hearing Summary, and all evidence the department used in making the determination that is in dispute; (2) complete the DHS-1520, Proof of Service and (3) mention to clients the availability of reimbursement for child care or transportation costs incurred in order to attend the hearing. BAM 600, (3-1-2014) p 16.

When the Department presents a case for an administrative hearing, policy allows the Department to use the hearing summary as a guide when presenting the evidence, witnesses and exhibits that support the Department's position. See BAM 600, page 28. But BAM 600 also requires the Department to **always** include the following in planning the case presentation: (1) an explanation of the action(s) taken; (2) a summary of the policy or laws used to determine that the action taken was correct; (3) any clarifications by central office staff of the policy or laws used; (4) the facts which led to the conclusion that the policy is relevant to the disputed case action; (5) the DHS procedures ensuring that the client received adequate or timely notice of the proposed action and affording all other rights. See BAM 600 at page 28. This implies that the Department has the initial burden of going forward with evidence during an administrative hearing.

Placing the burden of proof on the Department is merely a question of policy and fairness, but it is also supported by Michigan law. In *McKinstry v Valley Obstetrics-Gynecology Clinic, PC*, 428 Mich 167; 405 NW2d 88 (1987), the Michigan Supreme Court, citing *Kar v Hogan*, 399 Mich 529; 251 NW2d 77 (1979), said:

The term “burden of proof” encompasses two separate meanings. 9 Wigmore, Evidence (Chadbourn rev), § 2483 et seq., pp 276 ff.; McCormick, Evidence (3d ed), § 336, p 946. One of these meanings is the burden of persuasion or the risk of nonpersuasion.

The Supreme Court then added:

The burden of producing evidence on an issue means the liability to an adverse ruling (generally a finding or a directed verdict) if evidence on the issue has not been produced. It is usually cast first upon the party who has pleaded the existence of the fact, but as we shall see, the burden may shift to the adversary when the pleader has his initial duty. The burden of producing evidence is a critical mechanism in a jury trial, as it empowers the judge to decide the case without jury consideration when a party fails to sustain the burden.

The burden of persuasion becomes a crucial factor only if the parties have sustained their burdens of producing evidence and only when all of the evidence has been introduced. See *McKinstry*, 428 Mich at 93-94, quoting McCormick, Evidence (3d ed), § 336, p 947.

In other words, the burden of producing evidence (i.e., going forward with evidence) involves a party’s duty to introduce enough evidence to allow the trier of fact to render a reasonable and informed decision. Thus, the Department must provide sufficient evidence to enable the Administrative Law Judge to ascertain whether the Department followed policy in a particular circumstance.

In the instant matter, Claimant requested a hearing to challenge the Department’s determination concerning her daughter’s MA eligibility. In response, the Department failed to include a copy of the correct notice of case action that was used to request a hearing in this case. The Department representative who attended the hearing was unable to explain why the proper notice was not included in the hearing packet. The representative was also unable to indicate the Department’s action that was taken which was the subject of Claimant’s hearing request.

Testimony and other evidence must be weighed and considered according to its reasonableness. *Gardiner v Courtright*, 165 Mich 54, 62; 130 NW 322 (1911); *Dep’t of Community Health v Risch*, 274 Mich App 365, 372; 733 NW2d 403 (2007). Moreover, the weight and credibility of this evidence is generally for the fact-finder to determine. *Dep’t of Community Health*, 274 Mich App at 372; *People v Terry*, 224 Mich App 447, 452; 569 NW2d 641 (1997).

This Administrative Law Judge has carefully considered and weighed the testimony and other evidence in the record. In the instant matter, the Department failed to include a proper notice of case action or any of the proper documentation to address Claimant’s request for a hearing. Without appropriate documentation concerning Claimant’s daughter’s MA case, the Administrative Law Judge is unable to evaluate whether the Department accurately determined Claimant’s MA group eligibility and/or benefits.

Accordingly, this Administrative Law Judge finds that the Department has failed to carry its burden of proof and did not provide information necessary to enable this ALJ to determine whether the Department followed policy as required under BAM 600.

**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. Redetermine MA eligibility for Claimant's group back to the date of closure.
2. To the extent required by policy, provide Claimant and/or her group members with retroactive and/or supplemental MA benefits.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



---

**C. Adam Purnell**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: May 5, 2014

Date Mailed: May 5, 2014

**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

CAP/las

cc:

