

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

████████████████████
████████████████████
██████████
████████████████████

MAHS Reg. No.: 15-016957
Issue No.: 2001
Agency Case No.: ██████████
Hearing Date: November 19, 2015
County: Macomb (20-Warren))

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Michael J. Bennane

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 November 19, 2015, from Detroit, Michigan. Petitioner was represented by Petitioner. The Department of Health and Human Services (Department) was represented by ██████████

ISSUE

Did the Department properly close Petitioner's Medical Assistance (MA) benefits case?

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 May 8, 2015, the Department sent Petitioner a Health Care Coverage Determination Notice (HCCDN) informing Petitioner that Towhida and Mohammed Tajul were approved for MA with a \$1,214 deductible.
2. On July 14, 2015, the Department sent Petitioner a redetermination form due August 3, 2015.
3. On August 20, 2015, the Department sent Petitioner an HCCDN denying MA coverage for ██████████ effective October 1, 2015.
4. On September 14, 2015, the Department sent Petitioner an HCCDN denying MA coverage for ██████████ effective October 1, 2015.

5. On August 31, 2015, Petitioner requested a hearing to protest the denial of MA coverage.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Department policies are contained in the Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), Reference Tables Manual (RFT), and 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.

In the instant case, the Department failed to provide an MA budget either in the file provided to this Administrative Law Judge or to Petitioner himself.

The MA denial is based on a budget that was not provided. This omission did not allow the undersigned Administrative Law Judge to question Petitioner and the Department concerning its elements during the hearing.

The production of evidence to support the Department's position is clearly required under BAM 600 as well as general case law [see, for example, *Kar v Hogan*, 399 Mich 529; 251 NW2d 77 (1976)]. In *McKinstry v Valley Obstetrics-Gynecology Clinic, PC*, 428 Mich167; 405 NW 2d 88 (1987), the Michigan Supreme Court addressed the issue of burden of proof, stating in part:

The term "burden of proof" encompasses two separate meanings. [citation omitted.] One of these meanings is the burden of persuasion or the risk of nonpersuasion. The other is the risk of going forward or the risk of nonproduction.

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 on the party who has pleaded the existence of the fact, but..., the burden may shift to the adversary when the pleader has discharged [its] initial duty. The burden of producing evidence is a critical mechanism[.]

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.

McKinstry, 428 Mich at 93-94, quoting *McCormick*, Evidence (3d ed), Sec. 336, p. 946.

In other words, the burden of producing evidence (i.e., of going forward) involves a party's duty to introduce enough evidence to allow the trier of fact to render a reasonable and informed decision.

In the instant case, the Department was unable to sufficiently support whether the amount of Petitioner's MA benefits was correct. The Department did testify that Petitioner's child was covered under "My Child."


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 failed to provide an MA budget upon which it based its denial of MA benefits.

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. Reregister, reprocess and recalculate Petitioner's MA benefits and supplement for any missed benefits.



Michael J. Bennane
Administrative Law Judge
for Nick Lyon, Director
Department of Health and Human Services

Date Signed: **11/23/2015**

Date Mailed: **11/23/2015**

MJB / pf

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: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]