

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

MAHS Reg. No.: 15-017153
Issue No.: 3008
Agency Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: [REDACTED]
County: OAKLAND-DISTRICT 2

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Colleen Lack

HEARING DECISION

Following Petitioner'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 [REDACTED], from Lansing, Michigan. [REDACTED], the Claimant, appeared on his own behalf. The Department was represented by [REDACTED], Eligibility Specialist; and [REDACTED], Assistance Payments Supervisor.

ISSUE

Did the Department properly determine the amount of Claimant's Food Assistance Program (FAP) monthly allotment?

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 is an ongoing FAP recipient.
2. Claimant submitted documentation of medical expenses to the Department in [REDACTED]. (Department Exhibit A, pp. 2-19)
3. Claimant's monthly FAP allotment increased to \$ [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] (Department Exhibit A, p. 20)
4. Claimant's monthly FAP allotment increased to \$ [REDACTED] for [REDACTED]. (Department Exhibit A, p. 20)
5. Claimant filed hearing requests requesting an accounting regarding the medical expenses and subsequent FAP allotments on [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].

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 Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp program] is established by the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, 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 Department of Human Services) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1-.119b, and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001-.3011.

For non-income changes, the Department is to complete the FAP eligibility determination and required case actions in time to affect the benefit month that occurs 10 days after the change is reported. BAM 220, (July 1, 2015) p. 10.

BEM 550, 554, and 556 address the FAP budget. In calculating the FAP budget, the entire amount of earned and unearned countable income is budgeted. Every case is allowed the standard deduction shown in RFT 255. BEM 550, (July 1, 2015), pp. 1. A shelter expense is allowed when the FAP group has a shelter expense or contributes to the shelter expense. BEM 554, (October 1, 2014), p. 12. Heat and utility expenses can also be included as allowed by policy. Effective May 1, 2014, when processing applications, redeterminations, or when a change is reported clients are not automatically allowed the heat and utility (h/u) standard. The Department now includes only the utilities for which a client is responsible to pay. FAP groups that qualify for the h/u standard do not receive any other individual utility standards. FAP groups whose heat is included in their rent or fees are not eligible for the h/u standard, unless they are billed for excess heat payments from their landlord. However, FAP groups who have received a home heating credit (HHC) in an amount greater than \$20 in the certification month or in the immediately preceding 12 months prior to the certification month are eligible for the h/u standard. FAP groups who have received a Low Income Home Energy Assistance Payment (LIHEAP) payment or a LIHEAP payment was made on their behalf in an amount greater than \$20 in the application month or in the immediately preceding 12 months prior to the application month are eligible for the h/u standard. FAP groups not eligible for the h/u standard who have other utility expenses or contribute to the cost of other utility expenses are eligible for the individual utility standards. Use the individual standard for each utility the FAP group has responsibility to pay. BEM 554, pp. 14-23. Verified allowable medical expenses are also considered in the FAP budget. BEM 554, p. 8-12.

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, pp. 35-36 (April 1, 2015) 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. 36. 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, the Department has not provided sufficient evidence to review the FAP determination. The Department provided documentation establishing the medical

expenses were entered into Claimant's case record and an eligibility summary showing an increase in the FAP monthly allotment. However, the Department did not include a copy of any Notice of Case Action(s) or FAP budgets with their hearing summary and exhibits. (Department Exhibits A and B, pp. 1-21) Accordingly, there was not sufficient evidence for this ALJ to review whether or not the Department's determination(s) regarding Claimant's FAP monthly allotment were correct.

Claimant requested an audit of his FAP case going back six months. As discussed during the hearing proceedings, there is no jurisdiction for this ALJ to review the past 6 months. Normally, a hearing request must be filed within 90 days of the written notice of case action. However, for FAP only, a hearing request disputing the current level of benefits can be made at any time within the benefit period. BAM 600, p. 6. It is also noted that a previous administrative hearing was held on [REDACTED], based on Claimant's [REDACTED] hearing requests. (MAHS Reg. No. 15-014496 and 15-014854) Accordingly, this appeal can only address Claimant's FAP benefits as of September 2015.

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 determined the amount of Claimant's FAP monthly allotment.

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-determine Claimant's eligibility for FAP retroactive to [REDACTED] in accordance with Department policy.
2. Issue written notice of the determination in accordance with Department policy.

3. Supplement for lost benefits (if any) that Claimant was entitled to receive, if otherwise eligible and qualified in accordance with Department policy.

Colleen Lack

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

Date Signed: [REDACTED]

Date Mailed: [REDACTED]

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 **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:

