

State of New Jersey OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

INITIAL DECISION

OAL DKT. NO. HMA 09624-2024

G.M.		
Petitioner,		
V.		
Sussex County Board of		
Social Services	_	
Respondent.		
	Medicaid Only	
Failure	e to Verify Eligibility Appeal	
N.J	J.A.C. 10:71-2.2 and -2.3	

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Respondent denied petitioner's Medicaid Only application for failure to provide the following evidence of eligibility under N.J.A.C. 10:71-2.2(e): Medical history; complete financial history - G.M. has seven bank accounts;
a fully executed designated authorized representative form; billing ledger from Chelsea
life insurance information; credit card statements; title and car insurance information;
supporting documentation for the large expenditures from bank accounts; 401K, stocks
and bond information;

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1.

I FIND that petitioner or petitioner's representative is AUTHORIZED to pursue this appeal; therefore, I CONCLUDE that standing is established.
I FIND that petitioner or petitioner's representative is NOT AUTHORIZED to pursue this appeal; therefore, I CONCLUDE that standing is not been established.
II.
I FIND that petitioner did not timely provide all the required documentation under N.J.A.C. 10:71-2.2(e) and -2.3(a), and that no exceptional circumstances exist under N.J.A.C. 10:71-2.3(c); therefore, I CONCLUDE that the Medicaid Only application must be DENIED under N.J.A.C. 10:71-2.2(e).
I FIND that petitioner did not timely provide all the required documentation under N.J.A.C. 10:71-2.2(e) and -2.3(a), but that exceptional circumstances exist under N.J.A.C. 10:71-2.3(c); therefore, I CONCLUDE that the time limit for verification must be EXTENDED under N.J.A.C. 10:71-2.3(c).
I FIND that petitioner did not timely provide all the required documentation under N.J.A.C. 10:71-2.2(e) and -2.3(a); exceptional circumstances exist under N.J.A.C. 10:71-2.3(c); and petitioner has since provided all the required documentation; therefore, I CONCLUDE that the Medicaid Only application must be PROCESSED to determine eligibility under N.J.A.C. 10:71.
I FIND that petitioner timely provided all the required documentation under N.J.A.C. 10:71-2.2(e) and -2.3(a); therefore, I CONCLUDE that the Medicaid Only application must be PROCESSED to determine eligibility under N.J.A.C. 10:71.
ADDITIONAL FINDINGS OF FACT/CONCLUSIONS OF LAW Please see attached.
1 loade dee attached.

ORDER

ORDER that:	
Petitioner's appeal is DISMISSED beca	ause petitioner has no standing.
Petitioner is INELIGIBLE for Medicaid	
	nit for verification under N.J.A.C. 10:71-2.3(c)
	t for respondent to PROCESS the application
OF MEDICAL ASSISTANCE AND HE decision is deemed adopted as the fit 1396a(e)(14)(A) and N.J.S.A. 52:14B-10	TANT COMMISSIONER OF THE DIVISION EALTH SERVICES. This recommended nal agency decision under 42 U.S.C. § (f). The ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER STANCE AND HEALTH SERVICES cannot
New Jersey Court Rule 2:2-3 by the A Jersey, Richard J. Hughes Complex, PO request for judicial review must be made w	ave the right to seek judicial review under ppellate Division, Superior Court of New Box 006, Trenton, New Jersey 08625. A ithin 45 days from the date you receive this at an appeal to the Appellate Division, you
12/03/2024 DATE	Patrice E. Hobbs , ALJ
Date Record Closed:	12/03/2024
Date Filed with Agency:	12/03/2024
Date Sent to Parties:	12/03/2024

APPENDIX

Witnesses

For Petitioner:
Yale Hauptman, Esq.
For Respondent:
Kerry Garvey, Assistant Administrative Supervisor Family Services

Exhibits

For Petitioner:
P-A Request for Information
P-B Family Care Application
P-C Section 4 of Family Care Application
P-D Designation of Authorized Representative
P-E HIPPA Privacy Rule
For Respondent:
R-1 Hearing Summary
R-2 Family Care Application
R-3 Request for Information
R-4 Letter from Hauptman to Agency dated 05/14/24
R-5 Designation of Authorized Representative dated 12/20/23
R-6 Power of Attorney
R-7 Letter of Denial
R-8 List of Missing Documentation

Petitioner filed an application for NJ Family Care (R-2) on January 12, 2024. This form was signed by Yale Hauptman as her attorney. An attorney does not need a Designation of Authorized Representative Form (R-5). However, one was submitted, naming him as the authorized representative. The form is signed by Node Kludze as the authorized representative and not Hauptman. In addition, Kludze's signature is not witnessed. The form specifically states that the form has no effect unless each signature is witnessed. In addition, petitioner submitted a Power of Attorney (POA) (R-6) which states that her agents are Vladislav Miransky and/or Charline Bernard. Garvey admits that because of the many different names, it was unclear who they should have spoken to. However, the application itself is very clear. Section 1 lists the attorney's name and address for all mailings. Section 4 of the application also lists the attorney as the contact person for information. Garvey admits that the agency made a mistake and should have contacted Hauptman. Garvey states that Hauptman did not provide the documentation within the fourteen days as required. Hauptman argues that he would not have provided the documentation because the case was denied and closed. He further argues that he had to pursue the appeal to reopen the application. Based on the foregoing, I CONLCUDE that the petitioner must be given more time to submit the necessary documents to determine her eligibility.