

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 14-017928
Issue No.: FIP
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: February 12, 2015
County: LAPEER

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Colleen Lack

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 12, 2015, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED], Eligibility Specialist and Hearing Facilitator.

ISSUE

Did the Department properly deny Claimant's disability Medicaid (MA-P) application based on a failure to comply with verification requirements?

Did the Department properly determine Claimant's eligibility for the Family Independence Program (FIP) and the Food Assistance Program (FAP)?

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. On March 25, 2014, Claimant applied for MA-P with an Authorized Representative (AR).
2. On May 6, 2014, a Medical Determination Verification Checklist was issued to Claimant stating what verifications were needed by the May 16, 2014, due date.
3. On May 28, 2014, a Health Care Coverage Determination Notice was issued to Claimant stating the MA-P application was denied, but Healthy Michigan Plan (HMP) was approved for April 2014.

4. There was no evidence that the verification request and denial notice were sent to the AR.
5. On December 3, 2014, Claimant filed a hearing request contesting the Department's actions regarding MA, FIP, and FAP.

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).

MA

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.

Verification is usually required upon application or redetermination and for a reported change affecting eligibility or benefit level. Verifications are considered timely if received by the date they are due. The Department must allow a client 10 calendar days (or other time limit specified in policy) to provide the requested verification. The Department worker must tell the client what verification is required, how to obtain it, and the due date. The client must obtain required verification, but the Department must assist if they needs and requests help. If neither the client nor the local office can obtain verification despite a reasonable effort, the Department worker should use the best available information. If no evidence is available, the Department worker is to use their best judgment. For MA, the Department is to send a negative action notice when the client indicates refusal to provide a verification, or the time period given has elapsed. BAM 130, 10-1-2014, pp. 1-8.

In this case, the Department testified that they are willing to re-process the March 25, 2014, MA-P application because there is no evidence the Medical Determination Verification Checklist was sent to Claimant's AR. Accordingly, there is no need for this ALJ to further review the MA-P determination. The denial of the March 25, 2014, MA-P application, will be reversed.

FIP and FAP

The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-193, and 42 USC 601 to 679c. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FIP pursuant to 45 CFR 233-260, MCL 400.10, the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1-.119b, and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3101 to .3131.

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.

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, p. 33 (7-1-2013) But 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 p. 33. 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 merely 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.

In this case, Claimant marked that he was also contesting actions regarding the FIP and FAP programs on the request for hearing. There was no information pertaining to FIP or FAP in the Department's Hearing Summary and Exhibits. The Department witness was unable to find anything on the Department's computer system showing a recent FIP and/or FAP application/case action. However, the Department witness reviewed a document Claimant brought to the hearing proceedings, which had a different case number. It was noted that Claimant has moved between two local Department county offices and recently the Department's central processing offices have closed. Accordingly, it was unclear if there had been any recent FIP and/or FAP applications or case actions. Thus, there was insufficient evidence to enable this Administrative Law Judge to ascertain whether the Department followed policy in processing a recent FIP and/or FAP application or in taking any recent FIP and/or FAP case action(s).

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 denied Claimant's MA-P application based on a failure to comply with verification requirements and when it determined eligibility for any application(s)/case(s) for FIP and/or FAP.

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. Re-process Claimant's March 25, 2014, application for MA-P, to include any retroactive months applied for, in accordance with Department policy.

2. Re-determine Claimant's eligibility for any recent FIP and/or FAP applications or case action(s) that occurred within the 90 days prior to the December 3, 2014, hearing request, in accordance with Department policy.
3. Issue written notice(s) of the determination(s) in accordance with Department policy.
4. Supplement for lost benefits (if any) that Claimant was entitled to receive, if otherwise eligible and qualified in accordance with Department policy.



Colleen Lack
Administrative Law Judge
for Nick Lyon, Interim Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: **2/19/2015**

Date Mailed: **2/19/2015**

CL/hj

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:

