



**STATE OF WISCONSIN
Division of Hearings and Appeals**

In the Matter of

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
c/o [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

DECISION

MPA/162771

PRELIMINARY RECITALS

Pursuant to a petition filed December 15, 2014, under Wis. Stat. § 49.45(5), and Wis. Admin. Code § HA 3.03(1), to review a decision by the Division of Health Care Access and Accountability in regard to Medical Assistance, a telephone hearing was held on January 20, 2015.

The issue for determination is whether petitioner's appeal is timely.

There appeared at that time the following persons:

PARTIES IN INTEREST:

Petitioner:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
c/o [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Respondent:

Department of Health Services
1 West Wilson Street, Room 651
Madison, Wisconsin 53703

By: Marcie Oakes, RN

Division of Health Care Access and Accountability
1 West Wilson Street, Room 272
P.O. Box 309
Madison, WI 53707-0309

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:

Peter McCombs
Division of Hearings and Appeals

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Petitioner is a resident of Milwaukee County.
2. On September 29, 2014, the Division sent a written notice of negative action to the petitioner at her correct address.

3. The petitioner filed a hearing request that was post-marked December 15, 2015. It was received by the Division of Hearings and Appeals on December 19, 2014.
4. The negative action in this case was the modification of prior authorization for personal care worker services.

DISCUSSION

A hearing officer can only hear cases on the merits if there is jurisdiction to do so. There is no jurisdiction if a hearing request is untimely. An appeal of a negative action by an agency concerning Medical Assistance must be filed within 45 days of the date of the action. See Wisconsin Stat. § 49.45(5); Income Maintenance Manual § 3.3.1. A negative action can be the denial of an application or the reduction or termination of an ongoing case. The petitioner's appeal was filed (post-marked) 77 days after the date of the modification action. Thus, it was untimely, and no jurisdiction exists for considering the merits of the case.

The petitioner's representative testified that she does not remember receiving the September 29, 2014, notice. Where the evidence presented demonstrates that a notice was correctly mailed, this fact creates a rebuttable presumption of delivery that a petitioner must overcome with evidence demonstrating that the notice was not actually received.

This interpretation is confirmed by Wisconsin case law.

It is well established that the mailing of a letter creates a presumption that the letter was delivered and received. See, Nack v. State, 189 Wis. 633, 636, 208 N.W. 487(1926), (citing Wigmore, Evidence 2d. ed.) § 2153; 1 Wigmore, Evidence (2nd ed.) § 95) Mullen v. Braatz, 179 Wis. 2d 749, 753, 508 N.W.2d 446(Ct.App.1993); Solberg v. Sec. Of Dept of Health & Human Services, 583 F.Supp. 1095, 1097 (E.D.Wis.1984); Hagner v. United States, 285 U.S. 427, 430, 52. S.Ct. 417, 418(1932).

***(Portions of discussion not relevant here omitted).

This evidence raises a rebuttable presumption which merely shifts to the challenging party the burden of presenting credible evidence of non-receipt. United States v. Freeman, 402 F.Supp. 1080, 1082(E.D.Wis.1975). Such a presumption may not, however, be given conclusive effect without violating the due process clause. United States v. Bowen, 414 F.2nd 1268, 1273(3d.Cir.1969); Mullen v. Braatz, 179 Wis. 2d at 453. If the defendant denies receipt of the mailing, the presumption is spent and a question of fact is raised. (Examiner note: Citations omitted here.) The issue is then one of credibility for the factfinder. The factfinder may believe the denial of receipt, or the factfinder may disbelieve the denial of receipt.

See State ex. Rel. Flores v. State, 183 Wis.2d 587, at 612-3 ((1994).

I have reviewed the evidence carefully. The failure to remember whether or not she received the notice without any other documentation or corroborating testimony is insufficient to rebut the presumption of delivery. Based on the above, I must find that the petitioner is not entitled to a hearing on the merits at this time.

Petitioner should be aware that if her provider can show a medical need for more time, it can always request an amendment to the prior authorization for additional time with evidence to show the need for the additional time.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

There is no jurisdiction as the appeal is untimely.

REQUEST FOR A REHEARING

You may request a rehearing if you think this decision is based on a serious mistake in the facts or the law or if you have found new evidence that would change the decision. Your request must be **received within 20 days after the date of this decision**. Late requests cannot be granted.

Send your request for rehearing in writing to the Division of Hearings and Appeals, 5005 University Avenue, Suite 201, Madison, WI 53705-5400 **and** to those identified in this decision as "PARTIES IN INTEREST." Your rehearing request must explain what mistake the Administrative Law Judge made and why it is important or you must describe your new evidence and explain why you did not have it at your first hearing. If your request does not explain these things, it will be denied.

The process for requesting a rehearing may be found at Wis. Stat. § 227.49. A copy of the statutes may be found online or at your local library or courthouse.

APPEAL TO COURT

You may also appeal this decision to Circuit Court in the county where you live. Appeals must be filed with the Court **and** served either personally or by certified mail on the Secretary of the Department of Health Services, 1 West Wilson Street, Room 651, Madison, Wisconsin 53703, **and** on those identified in this decision as "PARTIES IN INTEREST" **no more than 30 days after the date of this decision** or 30 days after a denial of a timely rehearing (if you request one).

The process for Circuit Court Appeals may be found at Wis. Stat. §§ 227.52 and 227.53. A copy of the statutes may be found online or at your local library or courthouse.

Given under my hand at the City of Madison,
Wisconsin, this 27th day of February, 2015

\sPeter McCombs
Administrative Law Judge
Division of Hearings and Appeals



State of Wisconsin\DIVISION OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS

Brian Hayes, Administrator
Suite 201
5005 University Avenue
Madison, WI 53705-5400

Telephone: (608) 266-3096
FAX: (608) 264-9885
email: DHAmail@wisconsin.gov
Internet: <http://dha.state.wi.us>

The preceding decision was sent to the following parties on February 27, 2015.

Division of Health Care Access and Accountability