



RICK SNYDER
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS
MICHIGAN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING SYSTEM
Christopher Seppanen
Executive Director

MIKE ZIMMER
DIRECTOR



Date Mailed: March 14, 2016
MAHS Docket No.: 15-024493
Agency No.: [REDACTED]
Petitioner: [REDACTED]

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Kevin Scully

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 After due notice, telephone hearing was held on March 08, 2016, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Petitioner included [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] represented the Department of Health and Human Services (Department).

ISSUE

Did the Department of Health and Human Services (Department) properly close the Petitioner's 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. The Petitioner was an ongoing Medical Assistance (MA) recipient.
2. On September 24, 2015, the Department sent the Petitioner a Verification Checklist (DHS-3503) requesting proof of all earned and unearned income for the previous 30 days by October 5, 2015.
3. On October 21, 2015, the Department notified the Petitioner that it would close her Medical Assistance (MA) as of November 1, 2015.
4. On December 27, 2015, the Department received the Petitioner's request for a hearing protesting the closure of her Medical Assistance (MA) benefits.

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.

Clients must cooperate with the local office in determining initial and ongoing eligibility and this includes the completion of necessary forms. Department of Human Services Bridges Assistance Manual (BAM) 105 (July 1, 2015), p 8.

Verification means documentation or other evidence to establish the accuracy of the client's verbal or written statements. Verification is usually required at application/redetermination and for a reported change affecting eligibility or benefit level when it is required by policy, required as a local office option, or information regarding an eligibility factor is unclear, inconsistent, incomplete, or contradictory. The Department uses documents, collateral contacts, or home calls to verify information. A collateral contact is a direct contact with a person, organization, or agency to verify information from the client. When documentation is not available, or clarification is needed, collateral contact may be necessary. Department of Human Services Bridges Assistance Manual (BAM) 130 (July 1, 2015), pp 1-9.

The Department will tell the client what verification is required, how to obtain it, and the due date. BAM 130, p 3.

The size of the household will be determined by the principles of tax dependency in the majority of cases. Parents, children and siblings are included in the same household. Parents and stepparents are treated the same. Individual family members may be eligible under different categories.¹

The Petitioner was an ongoing Medical Assistance (MA) recipient. The Department initiated an investigation into the Petitioner's income sources based on a finding that her reported expenses exceed her reported income. The Department discovered that the father of the Petitioner's children is living in her home.

¹ Department of Health and Human Services Modified Adjusted Gross Income (MAGI) Related Eligibility Manual, p 12. This manual is available on the internet at http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mdch/MAGI_Manual_457706_7.pdf

On September 24, 2015, the Department sent the Petitioner a Verification Checklist (DHS-3503) requesting verification of all earned and unearned income for the previous 30 days. The Department's representative testified that the Petitioner's MA benefits were closed effective November 1, 2015, when she failed to provide verification of income received by the father of her children.

The production of evidence to support the department's position is clearly required under BAM 600 as well as general case law (see e.g., *Kar v Hogan*, 399 Mich 529; 251 NW2d 77 [1976]). In *McKinstry v Valley Obstetrics-Gynecology Clinic, PC*, 428 Mich167; 405 NW2d 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.

The Petitioner argued that she was not requesting MA benefits for the father of her children.

However, MA group size and composition is not determined by whether the recipient intends to waive benefits.

No evidence of the Petitioner's status as an income tax filler was presented during the hearing. This Administrative Law Judge finds that the Department failed to provide evidence to establish that the father of the Petitioner's children was a mandatory member of her MA benefit group and that it was a requirement that she provide verification of his income. Furthermore, the September 24, 2015, Verification Checklist (DHS-3503) form is not specific enough to put the Petitioner on notice that it was income received by the father of her children that was required.

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 did not act in accordance with Department policy when it closed the Petitioner's Medical Assistance (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. Initiate a determination of the Petitioner's eligibility for Medical Assistance (MA) as of November 1, 2015.
2. Provide the Petitioner with a Notice of Case Action (DHS-1605) describing the Department's revised eligibility determination.
3. Issue the Petitioner any retroactive benefits she may be eligible to receive, if any.

KS/las



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

NOTICE OF APPEAL: A party may appeal this Order in circuit court within 30 days of the receipt date. A copy of the circuit court appeal must be filed with the Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS).

A party may request a rehearing or reconsideration of this Order if the request is received by MAHS within 30 days of the date the Order was issued. The party requesting a rehearing or reconsideration must provide the specific reasons for the request. MAHS will not review any response to a request for rehearing/reconsideration.

A written request may be mailed or faxed to MAHS. If submitted by fax, the written request must be faxed to (517) 335-6088; 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

DHHS

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Petitioner

[REDACTED]