

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

██████████
████████████████████
██████████
████████████████████

Reg. No.: 14-006739
Issue No.: 3002
Case No.: ██████████
Hearing Date: August 7, 2014
County: MACOMB-12

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: ROBERT J. CHAVEZ

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 August 7, 2014, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included ██████████. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included ██████████, Hearings Facilitator.

ISSUE

Due to a failure to comply with the verification requirements, did the Department properly deny Claimant's application close Claimant's case reduce Claimant's benefits for:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA)? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC)? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA)? | |

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, including testimony of witnesses, finds as material fact:

1. Claimant applied for received:
 FIP FAP MA SDA CDC
benefits.
2. Claimant was required to submit requested verification by June 2, 2014.

3. On July 1, 2014, the Department
 - denied Claimant's application.
 - closed Claimant's case.
 - reduced Claimant's benefits.
4. On June 26, 2014, the Department sent Claimant/Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of its action.
5. On July 7, 2014, Claimant/Claimant's Authorized Hearing Representative (AHR) filed a hearing request, protesting the Department's 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), and Department of Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly 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 273. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1-.119b, and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001 to .3015.

Additionally, the Department may require verification of eligibility factors that are unclear or inconsistent. BAM 130.

Claimant had reported a change in her shelter expense, making the expense, as currently included in claimant's FAP budget, inconsistent. As such, the Department removed the current expense until claimant provided verification of the new expense.

Though claimant testified that she had returned the verification via fax, claimant was unable to provide evidence that the fax had been sent. Furthermore, claimant testified that she herself had not sent the fax, and the sending of the fax had been done by a third party.

Therefore, as the claimant had no evidence that the verification had been returned, and could not testify that a third party had actually sent the fax, claimant is unable to meet her burden of proof in rebutting the Department records that show no such verification had been returned.

As such, the undersigned must rule that the Department was correct to remove the shelter expense from claimant's FAP budget, and lower claimant's FAP benefits.

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 reduced claimant's FAP benefits.

DECISION AND ORDER

Accordingly, the Department's decision is

AFFIRMED.



ROBERT J. CHAVEZ
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: August 18, 2014
Date Mailed: August 18, 2014

RJC/tm

NOTICE OF APPEAL: A party may appeal this Hearing Decision in the circuit court in the county in which he/she resides, or the circuit court in Ingham County, within 30 days of the receipt date.

A party may request a rehearing or reconsideration of this Hearing Decision from the Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS) within 30 days of the mailing date of this Hearing Decision, or MAHS may order a rehearing or reconsideration on its own motion.

MAHS may grant a party's Request for Rehearing or Reconsideration 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 party requesting a rehearing or reconsideration 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 this Hearing Decision is mailed.

A written request may be faxed or mailed to MAHS. If submitted by fax, 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

cc: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]