



Date Mailed: August 11, 2025

Docket No.: 25-025902

Case No.: [REDACTED]

Petitioner: [REDACTED]



This is an important legal document. Please have someone translate the document.

هذه وثيقة قانونية مهمة. يرجى أن يكون هناك شخص ما يترجم المستند.

এটি একটি গুরুত্বপূর্ণ আইনি ডকুমেন্ট। দয়া করে কেউ দস্তাবেজ অনুবাদ করুন।

Este es un documento legal importante. Por favor, que alguien traduzca el documento.

这是一份重要的法律文件。请让别人翻译文件。

Ky është një dokument ligjor i rëndësishëm. Ju lutem, kini dikë ta përktheni dokumentin.

Date Mailed: August 11, 2025

Docket No.: 25-025902

Case No.: [REDACTED]

Petitioner: [REDACTED]

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 hearing was held via telephone conference on August 7, 2025. Petitioner appeared and was unrepresented. [REDACTED] also testified on Petitioner's behalf. The Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS or Department) was represented by Jamila Goods, Eligibility Specialist.

ISSUES

Did the Department properly close Petitioner's Food Assistance Program (FAP) case?

Did the Department properly close Petitioner's adult daughter, [REDACTED] (Daughter)'s Medical Assistance/Medicaid (MA) case?

Did the Department process Petitioner's State Disability Assistance (SDA) cash assistance application within the standard of promptness?

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. Petitioner and Daughter were ongoing recipients of FAP benefits and MA coverage.
2. On February 13, 2025, MDHHS issued a Wage Match Client Notice to Daughter, requesting that she submit verification of her income from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (Employer) to MDHHS by March 17, 2025 (Exhibit A, pp. 7-9).
3. On [REDACTED] 2025, Petitioner applied for cash assistance on the basis of disability (Exhibit A, pp. 17-22).
4. On June 25, 2025, MDHHS referred Petitioner's SDA application to the Medical Review Team (MRT) for a determination of disability.

-
-
5. On June 27, 2025, MDHHS issued a Notice of Case Action to Petitioner, informing her that her FAP case was closed for failure to return the requested verification of income (Exhibit A, pp. 13-16).
 6. On June 27, 2025, MDHHS issued a Healthcare Coverage Determination Notice to Petitioner, informing her that Daughter's MA case was closed for failure to return the requested verifications (Exhibit A, pp. 10-12).
 7. On July 11, 2025, Petitioner submitted a request for hearing, disputing the closure of her FAP case, closure of Daughter's MA case, and that she believes the timeframe to process her SDA application lapsed (Exhibit A, pp. 3-5).

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.

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 this case, Petitioner disputes the closure of her FAP case and the closure of Daughter's MA case.

On February 13, 2025, MDHHS issued a Wage Match Client Notice to Daughter, requesting that she submit verification of her income from Employer to MDHHS by March 17, 2025. MDHHS routinely matches recipient and applicant data with other public and private agencies through computer data exchanges in order to verify income and other eligibility factors. BAM 800 (April 2022), p. 1. MDHHS will request verification of the wage match earnings by generating a DHS-4638, Wage Match Client Notice, which automatically gives the client 30 days to provide the verification. If verifications are not returned by the 30th day, case action will need to be initiated to close the case in

25-025902

Bridges. For FAP cases only, the wage match information is held and addressed at the next semi-annual, mid-certification or redetermination (whichever comes first). BAM 802 (June 2025), pp. 2-3.

Here, MDHHS did not initiate case closure until June 27, 2025 for FAP and MA. MDHHS did not have an explanation for the case closure effective date. Petitioner and Daughter each credibly testified that they did not receive the Wage Match Client Notice in February 2025 but rather received the form after the request for hearing was submitted in July. Petitioner testified that upon receiving the Wage Match Client Notice, she immediately submitted the requested verification. This testimony was corroborated by MDHHS' testimony that they received the completed verification on July 28, 2025. Petitioner's testimony that she would have timely submitted the requested verification if she had received it prior to July 2025 is additionally corroborated by her prior timely submissions of verification of employment. MDHHS was unable to present any evidence to dispute Petitioner's credible testimony. Therefore, MDHHS failed to satisfy its burden that it acted in accordance with policy in closing Petitioner's FAP case and Daughter's MA case.

Additionally, Petitioner filed a hearing request alleging that the timeframe for MDHHS to process her SDA application has lapsed. The standard of promptness (SOP) for an application begins the date that the Department receives an application. MDHHS must certify program approval or denial for SDA applications within 60 days. Clients have the right to contest a MDHHS decision affecting eligibility or benefit levels whenever they believe *the decision* is incorrect. BAM 600, p. 1. Here, Petitioner applied for SDA on June 6, 2025. MDHHS testified that her application is still pending, and no decision has yet been made. As MDHHS is within the SOP for the determination regarding Petitioner's SDA application, and no decision has yet been made, Petitioner's hearing request regarding SDA is ripe and will be dismissed.

DECISION AND ORDER

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 MDHHS failed to satisfy its burden that it acted in accordance with policy in closing Petitioner's FAP case and Daughter's MA case.

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 Petitioner's FAP case as of July 1, 2025;
2. Begin recalculating the FAP budget for July 1, 2025, ongoing;

25-025902

3. If Petitioner is eligible for FAP benefits, issue supplements to Petitioner for any FAP benefits she was eligible to receive but did not from July 1, 2025, ongoing;
4. Reprocess Daughter's MA case to determine the most beneficial category of coverage in accordance with policy and consistent with this hearing decision;
5. If Daughter is eligible for MA benefits, provide coverage to Daughter for any MA that she was eligible to receive but did not from August 1, 2025 ongoing;
6. Notify Petitioner of its decision in writing.

Petitioner's hearing request for SDA is **DISMISSED**.



DANIELLE NUCCIO
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

APPEAL RIGHTS: Petitioner may appeal this Hearing Decision to the circuit court. Rules for appeals to the circuit court can be found in the Michigan Court Rules (MCR), including MCR 7.101 to MCR 7.123, available at the Michigan Courts website at courts.michigan.gov. The Michigan Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules (MOAHR) cannot provide legal advice, but assistance may be available through the State Bar of Michigan at <https://lrs.michbar.org> or Michigan Legal Help at <https://michiganlegalhelp.org>. A copy of the circuit court appeal should be sent to MOAHR. A circuit court appeal may result in a reversal of the Hearing Decision.

Either party who disagrees with this Hearing Decision may also send a written request for a rehearing and/or reconsideration to MOAHR within 30 days of the mailing date of this Hearing Decision. The request should include Petitioner's name, the docket number from page 1 of this Hearing Decision, an explanation of the specific reasons for the request, and any documents supporting the request. The request should be sent to MOAHR

- by email to MOAHR-BSD-Support@michigan.gov, **OR**
- by fax at (517) 763-0155, **OR**
- by mail addressed to
Michigan Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules
Rehearing/Reconsideration Request
P.O. Box 30639
Lansing Michigan 48909-8139

25-025902

Documents sent via email are not secure and can be faxed or mailed to avoid any potential risks. Requests MOAHR receives more than 30 days from the mailing date of this Hearing Decision may be considered untimely and dismissed.



Via Electronic Mail:

Respondent

WAYNE-INKSTER-DHHS
26355 MICHIGAN AVE
INKSTER, MI 48141
MDHHS-WAYNE-19-HEARINGS@MICHIGAN.GOV

Via First Class Mail:

Petitioner

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] MI [REDACTED]