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

IN THE MATTER OF:

Reg. No.: 15-008155 Issue No.: 2003

Case No.:

Hearing Date: July 13, 2015 County: Wayne-District 19

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Zainab Baydoun

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; and Mich Admin Code, R 792.11002. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on July 13, 2015, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Health and Human Services (Department) included Hearings Facilitator.

ISSUE

Did the Department properly close Claimant and her husband's Medical Assistance (MA) case based on a failure to complete a redetermination??

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 MA benefits.
- 2. On April 14, 2015, the Department sent Claimant a Redetermination for her MA case that was to be completed and returned to the Department by May 1, 2015. (Exhibit A)
- On May 18, 2015, the Department sent Claimant a Health Care Coverage Determination Notice informing her that effective June 1, 2015, Claimant and her husband's MA cases would be closed based on a failure to return the Redetermination. (Exhibit B)

4. On May 27, 2015, Claimant requested a hearing disputing the Department's actions.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Department policies are contained in the Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), Department of Health and Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT), and Department of Health and 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 Department of Human Services) administers the MA program pursuant to 42 CFR 435, MCL 400.10, and MCL 400.105-.112k.

Additionally, the Department must periodically redetermine an individual's eligibility for active programs. The redetermination process includes a thorough review of all eligibility factors. BAM 210 (April 2015), p 1. A client must complete a redetermination at least every 12 months in order for the Department to determine the client's continued eligibility for benefits. BAM 210, p. 1. The Department allows clients a full 10 calendar days from the date the verification is requested (date of request is not counted) to provide all documents and information for MA redeterminations. BAM 210, p.14. For MA cases, benefits stop at the end of the benefit period unless a redetermination is completed and a new benefit period is certified. BAM 210, p. 2. The Department will provide the client with timely notice of the negative action by sending a Notice of Case Action if the time limit is not met. BAM 210, p.14.

In this case, the Department testified that because it did not receive a completed redetermination by the due date and before the end of the certification period, it sent Claimant a Health Care Coverage Determination Notice on May 18, 2015, informing her that effective June 1, 2015, MA benefits for herself and for her husband would be terminated due to a failure to return the redetermination. BAM 210, p. 14; (Exhibit B). The Department testified that it did receive communications from Claimant concerning the redetermination; however, the contact was not made until after Claimant's MA case had already closed.

At the hearing, Claimant testified that she did not receive the redetermination from the Department which is why it was not completed and returned. The proper mailing and addressing of a letter creates a presumption of receipt. That presumption may be rebutted by evidence. *Stacey v Sankovich*, 19 Mich App 638 (1969); *Good v Detroit Automobile Inter-Insurance Exchange*, 67 Mich App 270 (1976). Although the

redetermination was mailed to Claimant at her confirmed mailing address, Claimant credibly stated that she was having trouble with receiving mail. Claimant testified that her home has several different mail carriers and doesn't always receive mail. Claimant testified that sometimes she receives her neighbors' mail and that sometimes her neighbors bring her mail that was dropped off at their home. Claimant testified that she reported the issues with her mail to the post master and to her Department case worker. Claimant indicated that she did not contact the Department prior to the June 1, 2015, case closure because she did not know that her MA case was closing. Therefore, Claimant has presented sufficient evidence to rebut the presumption that she received the redetermination.

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 because Claimant established that she did not receive the redetermination, the Department did not act in accordance with Department policy when it closed Claimant and her husband's MA case based on a failure to return the redetermination.

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 and her husband's MA cases effective June 1, 2015;
- 2. Provide Claimant and her husband with MA coverage from June 1, 2015, ongoing; and
- 3. Notify Claimant in writing of its decision.

Zainab Bavdoun

Administrative Law Judge for Nick Lyon, Director Department of Health and Human Services

Lamab Kaydom

Date Signed: 7/24/2015

Date Mailed: 7/24/2015

ZB / tlf

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 copy of the claim or application for appeal must be filed with the Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS).

A party may request a rehearing or reconsideration of this Hearing Decision from MAHS within 30 days of the mailing date of this Hearing Decision, or MAHS <u>MAY</u> order a rehearing or reconsideration on its own motion. MAHS <u>MAY</u> 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

