

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 15-001736  
Issue No.: 2002, 3002  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: March 03, 2015  
County: Macomb (12) (Mt Clemens)

**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 three-way telephone hearing was held on March 3, 2015, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Hearings Facilitator [REDACTED].

**ISSUE**

Did the Department properly close Claimant's Food Assistance Program (FAP) and 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 was an on-going recipient of FAP and MA benefits.
2. A redetermination packet and a shelter verification form were mailed to Claimant on October 14, 2014. Her responses were due by November 3, 2014.
3. Claimant had the shelter verification completed and returned by the due date, verifying her change in address and new shelter expense.
4. The redetermination was not returned by the due date.
5. On January 16, 2015, the Department mailed a Health Care Coverage Determination Notice informing her that the MA was closed because the redetermination was not completed timely.
6. The Department also closed Claimant's FAP because the redetermination was not completed.

7. The Department received Claimant's hearing request on January 28, 2015.

### **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.

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.

“Clients must cooperate with the local office in determining initial and ongoing eligibility. This includes completion of necessary forms; see Refusal to Cooperate Penalties in this item. Clients must completely and truthfully answer all questions on forms and in interviews.” BAM 105.

Per BAM 130, at page 6, says:

Verifications are considered to be timely if received by the date they are due. For electronically transmitted verifications (fax, email or Mi Bridges document upload), the date of the transmission is the receipt date. Verifications that are submitted after the close of regular business hours through the drop box or by delivery of a DHS representative are considered to be received the next business day.

Send a negative action notice when:

The client indicates refusal to provide a verification, **or**

The time period given has elapsed and the client has **not** made a reasonable effort to provide it.

The issue is whether the Claimant provided timely verification in response to the request. The evidence is persuasive that the form was mailed to the Claimant at her address of record. The evidence also establishes that the Claimant did not fully respond by the deadline.

The Department used the address that the Claimant provided – and which she verified at the hearing. In common-law, there is a presumption that letters have been received after being placed in the mail in the due course of business. See *Good v Detroit Automobile Inter-Insurance Exchange*, 67 Mich App 270, 275-278 (1976). Claimant testified that she received the shelter verification and had it completed by her landlord. She then faxed it in to the Department. Claimant also testified that she did not receive the redetermination. She testified credibly that, had she received the redetermination, she would have completed and returned it. That is bolstered by her testimony that she made repeated phone calls to her case worker, and left multiple messages requesting help from her worker, but her calls were never returned. Claimant has rebutted the presumption that the letter was received.

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 Claimant's MA and 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. The Department shall initiate a redetermination as to whether Claimant is entitled to MA benefits as provided by applicable policies.
2. Redetermine Claimant's FAP benefit eligibility;
3. Issue a supplement to Claimant for any FAP benefits improperly not issued.



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

Date Signed: **3/4/2015**

Date Mailed: **3/4/2015**

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:

