

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

██████████  
██████████  
██████████

Reg. No.: 2014-30548  
Issue No.: 2007  
Case No.: ██████████  
Hearing Date: April 14, 2014  
County: Wayne (82-76)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Michael J. Bennane

**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 14, 2014, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant ██████████. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included ██████████.

**ISSUE**

Did the Department properly calculate Claimant's Medical Assistance (MA) benefits?

**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 is an ongoing recipient of MA benefits, but the Department was unable to provide the date that Claimant's MA benefits were applied for.
2. The Department imposed a deductible on Claimant's MA but did not provide a notice of case action announcing that negative action.
3. On February 28, 2014, Claimant requested a hearing to protest the addition of a deductible to her MA 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 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 the Department's hearing summary, the Department states that it has sent the problem regarding Claimant's MA benefits to the "help desk." In that same document the Department references an error with the case.

Claimant testified that unpaid medical bills date back to August 2012.

The imposition of the deductible on Claimant's MA is based on a budget that was not provided. This omission did not allow the undersigned Administrative Law Judge to question Claimant and the Department concerning its elements during the hearing.

The production of evidence to support the Department's position is clearly required under BAM 600 as well as general case law [see, for example, *Kar v Hogan*, 399 Mich 529; 251 NW2d 77 (1976)]. In *McKinstry v Valley Obstetrics-Gynecology Clinic*, PC 428 Mich167; 405 NW 2d 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.

In other words, the burden of producing evidence (i.e., of going forward) involves a party's duty to introduce enough evidence to allow the trier of fact to render a reasonable and informed decision.

In the instant case, the Department was unable to sufficiently support whether the amount of the deductible was correct.

The Department did not meet the burden of showing, through evidence, that its actions are supported by policy.

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 .
- did not act in accordance with Department policy when it .
- failed to satisfy its burden of showing that it acted in accordance with Department policy when it did not provide the budget upon which it based Claimant's MA deductible.

**DECISION AND ORDER**

Accordingly, the Department's decision is

- AFFIRMED.
- REVERSED.
- AFFIRMED IN PART with respect to                      and REVERSED IN PART with respect to .
- 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. Return to the date of Claimant's latest MA application and process all medical bills that have been submitted by Claimant.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Michael J. Bennane**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: April 28, 2014

Date Mailed: April 28, 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

MJB/pf

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