

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 201434849  
Issue No(s): 3002  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: May 19, 2014  
County: Wayne (19)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Alice C. Elkin

**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 May 19, 2014, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED], Assistance Payment Worker.

**ISSUE**

Did the Department properly close Claimant's Food Assistance Program (FAP) case for failure to return completed Wage Match Client Notices?

**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 was an ongoing recipient of FAP benefits.
2. On October 16, 2013, the Department sent Claimant two Wage Match Client Notices, one for [REDACTED] (Employer 1) and the other for [REDACTED] (Employer 2), requiring both employers to return the completed forms to the Department by November 15, 2013.
3. On March 5, 2014, the Department sent Claimant a Notice of Case Action informing her that her FAP case would close effective April 1, 2014 because she had failed to verify requested information.

4. On April 1, 2014, Claimant filed a request for hearing disputing 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), 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.

Additionally, when there is a discrepancy between the wage match information and the client's work history stated on an application or other information in the client's case record, the Department must request verification from the client by sending a Wage Match Client Notice (DHS-4638). BAM 802 (December 2013), p. 2. If verifications are not returned by the 30th day, the case will close for a minimum of 30 days after appropriate actions are taken in the Department's system unless the client returns verifications. BAM 802, p. 2.

In this case, the Department testified that Claimant's FAP case closed because she had failed to obtain completed Wage Match Client Notices for Employer 1 or Employer 2. At the hearing, Claimant admitted receiving the Notices but explained that she had addressed and resolved this issue in October 2013 or November 2013. She credibly testified that she met with her worker's supervisor who advised her that Employer 1, with whom she continued to be employed, faxed the completed form to the Department, and because Employer 2, with whom she had terminated employment in August 2013, was not cooperative, it would proceed without verification from Employer 2. The worker at the hearing reviewed Claimant's file at the hearing and found no evidence of a response from either employer. However, the worker's supervisor was not at the hearing to counter Claimant's credible testimony that, with respect to Employer 1, the documents were provided and, with respect to Employer 2, the Department did not terminate assistance because the employer refused to verify income. See BEM 501 (January 2014), p. 9; BAM 130 (January 2014), p 3. Claimant's credibility is further bolstered by the fact that the Department sent her a December 10, 2013 Notice of Case Action approving her FAP benefits; if the Wage Match issues had remained outstanding at that that time, it follows that Claimant would not be eligible for 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 did not act in accordance with Department policy when it closed Claimant's FAP case.

**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. Reinstate Claimant's FAP case effective April 1, 2014;
2. Issue supplements to Claimant for FAP benefits she was eligible to receive but did not from April 1, 2014 ongoing.



**Alice C. Elkin**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: May 22, 2014

Date Mailed: May 22, 2014

**NOTICE OF APPEAL:** A party may appeal this Hearing Decision in the circuit court in the county in which he/she resides or has its principal place of business in the State, 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.

2014-34849/ACE

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

ACE/tlf

cc:

