

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 14-017113  
Issue No.: 2001  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: February 11, 2015  
County: MONTCALM

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Darryl Johnson

**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 February 11, 2015, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant and his wife, [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Lead Worker [REDACTED].

**ISSUE**

Did the Department properly close Medical Assistance (MA) benefits for a child placed in Claimant's custody and care?

**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 and his wife applied for MA for [REDACTED], a four-year-old child who was born in [REDACTED] to a mother who was a citizen of [REDACTED], after the child was placed in their custody by the [REDACTED].
2. MA was approved for the child on August 27, 2014, for a 90-day period, and a Verification Checklist was issued for Claimant to provide verification that a Social Security Number was issued to the child.
3. On November 15, 2014, the Department closed the child's MA.
4. The Department received Claimant's hearing request on November 24, 2014.

## 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 Title XIX of the Social Security Act, 42 USC 1396-1396w-5; 42 USC 1315; the Affordable Care Act of 2010, the collective term for the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, Pub. L. No. 111-148, as amended by the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, Pub. L. No. 111-152; and 42 CFR 430.10-.25. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to 42 CFR 435, MCL 400.10, and MCL 400.105-.112k.

It will be noted that the hearing summary (Exhibit G Page 1) says “verification was received of Social Security Number.” The worker who drafted the hearing summary did not participate in the hearing. The worker who testified said the Department has not received verification of the Social Security Number (SSN). The evidence is conflicting as to whether the child has been provided a SSN.

The Department provided a Form I-797C from the Department of Homeland Security noting a Petition for [REDACTED] Immigrant was received for the child on [REDACTED]. Also submitted was a copy of the child’s infant passport (Exhibit D Page 2) and his current visa (Exhibit D Page 3.) In BEM 225 (10/1/14) at page 35 policy notes that an I-797 is issued to applicants/petitioners to acknowledge receipt of applications, convey statuses, etc. It verifies permanent resident alien status when it acknowledges both receipt of application for a replacement I-551 and receipt of the old I-551.” The Claimant has provided an I-797, which is documentation from the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services regarding citizenship/alien status of the child.

The child's Visa bears the following annotation: “To meet with [REDACTED] as well as with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] regarding physical therapy treatment, Michigan.” The child was granted a Visa for the express purpose of allowing him to receive medical treatment. Evidence was submitted that Claimant and his wife have done all that they could to obtain the necessary documentation for the child. They are just waiting for the bureaucratic process to be completed – if it has not yet been completed.

Because of the conflict in the oral testimony from the witness and the written testimony from the case worker, it is unclear whether “verification was received of the Social Security Number.”

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 (1/1/15), page 19.

Hearing  
Summary

**All Programs**

Complete a DHS-3050, Hearing Summary, prior to the meaningful prehearing conference. In the event additional space is required to complete the DHS-3050, Hearing Summary, attach a Word document to the DHS-3050 and number the Word document accordingly. All case identifiers and notations on case status must be complete.

The hearing summary must include all of the following:

- A clear statement of the case action, in chronological order, including all programs involved in the case action.
- Facts which led to the action.
- Policy which supported the action.
- Correct address of the client and the AHR.
- Description of the documents the local office intends to offer as exhibits at the hearing.

Number the document copies consecutively in the lower right corner; begin numbering with the hearing summary.

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 35. 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 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.

Because of the conflict between the evidence, 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 closed the child's MA.

### **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. The Department shall initiate a redetermination as to whether the child is entitled to MA benefits as provided by applicable policies.



**Darryl Johnson**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Nick Lyon, Interim Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: **2/17/2015**

Date Mailed: **2/17/2015**

DJ/jaf

**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 48909-8139

cc:

