

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 14-016191
Issue No.: 3008
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: December 18, 2014
County: Oakland-District 3

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Kevin Scully

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 December 18, 2014, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED].

ISSUE

Did the Department properly the Claimant's Food Assistance Program (FAP) 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. The Claimant is an ongoing Food Assistance Program (FAP) recipient.
2. The Department approved the Claimant for a \$ [REDACTED] monthly allotment of Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits effective November 1, 2014.
3. The Department received the Claimant's request for a hearing on October 21, 2014, protesting the determination of her monthly allotment of Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits.

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).

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.

Food Assistance Program (FAP) groups with one or more senior, disabled, or veteran (SDV) members, the Department will apply a deduction for verified medical expenses over \$ [REDACTED]. Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 554 (October 1, 2014), p 1. Total allowable monthly medical expenses are rounded down to the dollar if the cents are 01-49, and rounded up if cents are 50-99. Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 556 (July 1, 2013), p 4.

In this case, the Claimant is an ongoing Food Assistance Program (FAP) recipient. The Department's representative testified that the Claimant reported medical expenses in the amounts of \$ [REDACTED], \$ [REDACTED], and \$ [REDACTED]. The Department provided a budget showing that a medical expense deduction of \$ [REDACTED] was applied in the Food Assistance Program (FAP) budget against her income. The Department failed to explain how this amount was determined.

The production of evidence to support the Department's position is clearly required under BAM 600 as well as general case law (see e.g., *Kar v Hogan*, 399 Mich 529; 251 NW2d 77 [1976]). In *McKinstry v Valley Obstetrics-Gynecology Clinic, PC*, 428 Mich 167; 405 NW2d 88 (1987), the Michigan Supreme Court addressed the issue of burden of proof, stating in part:

The term "burden of proof" encompasses two separate meanings. [citation omitted.] One of these meanings is the burden of persuasion or the risk of nonpersuasion. The other is the risk of going forward or the risk of nonproduction. 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 on the party who has pleaded the existence of the fact, but..., the burden may shift to the adversary when the pleader has discharged [its] initial duty. The burden of producing evidence is a critical mechanism[.]

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.

McKinstry, 428 Mich at 93-94, quoting McCormick, *Evidence* (3d ed), Sec. 336, p. 946.

Because the Department was unable to meet its burden to establish that it properly applied its policies towards the Claimant's circumstances, this Administrative Law Judge has no choice but to reverse the Department's determination and order a review of the Claimant's Food Assistance Program (FAP) eligibility.


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 failed to satisfy its burden of showing that it acted in accordance with Department policy when it determined the Claimant's Food Assistance Program (FAP) allotment level.

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. Initiate a determination of the Claimant's eligibility for the Food Assistance Program (FAP) as of October 1, 2014.
2. Provide the Claimant with a Notice of Case Action (DHS-1605) describing the Department's revised eligibility determination.
3. Provide the Claimant with a listing of all ongoing and one-time medical expenses used to determine her Food Assistance Program (FAP) eligibility for October and November.
4. Issue the Claimant any retroactive benefits she may be eligible to receive, if any.



Kevin Scully
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: **12/19/2014**

Date Mailed: **12/19/2014**

KS/las

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:

