



State of New Jersey
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

INITIAL DECISION

OAL DKT. NO. HMA 11143-25

AGENCY DKT. NO. N/A

P.W.,

Petitioner,

v.

**DIVISION OF MEDICAL
ASSISTANCE AND HEALTH
SERVICES,**

Respondent.

S.W., family member on behalf of petitioner, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 1:10B-5.1¹

Judith Coles, New Jersey Family Care, appearing pursuant to N.J.A.C. 1:1-5.4(a)3

Record Closed: October 1, 2025

Decided: October 17, 2025

BEFORE **SARAH G. CROWLEY**, ALJ:

¹ There is some confusion as to the petitioner in this case as the caption indicates it only related to P.W., who is S.W.'s son. In addition, there is a reference to petitioner's daughter, who also has the initials P.W. also having failed to complete documentation.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The petitioner's NJ Medicaid benefits were terminated because the renewal application, which was due on January 31, 2024, was never filed. Petitioner requested a fair hearing, and the matter was filed at the Office of Administrative Law (OAL), to be heard as a contested case pursuant to N.J.S.A. 52:14B-1 to 15 and 14F-1 to 13. The matter was heard on October 1, 2025, and the record closed on October 2, 2025, after giving both of the parties the opportunity to supplement the record due to the confusion regarding who was being terminated and why.

TESTIMONY AND FINDINGS OF FACT

Judith Coles is an employee of New Jersey Family Care State Monitoring and testified on behalf of the respondent. She testified that the petitioner failed to complete the redetermination form and thus was terminated. She was unclear who the application was for and why the within transmitted case referenced S.W. son P.W. only, but the documents referenced S.W., as well as a daughter P.W. Ms. Coles provided extensive testimony regarding income information and payroll confirmation. However, the denial was predicated upon a failure to submit redetermination documents, so it was unclear to the undersigned why this information was provided. Moreover, if the income information that was provided was inadequate, the benefits should have been termination for failure to provide proper verification, not failure to file redetermination application. The undersigned gave Ms. Coles several opportunities to clarify the grounds for termination, the timing of the termination and who was being terminated. Ms. Coles clarified that the application related to all member of the household, and just the first is listed.

S.W. testified that she was very confused by the entire proceeding and that she had called several times and received a different explanation each time. She testified that she did in fact complete the redetermination application and provided the supporting documentation. This testimony was consistent with Ms. Coles' discussion about the payroll documents that were in fact submitted. Query as to why she would be reviewing and analyzing payroll documents if the redetermination application had never been filed

as stated in the papers. S.W. testified that she received the redetermination application in October of 2023 and received notification they were renewed in November of 2024. She also testified that her household includes her two children, and she is unclear as to why this transmittal only listed her son P.W. Did that mean petitioner and her daughter remained covered and this termination did not apply to them. Again, Ms. Coles could not clarify any such issues.

LEGAL ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

The sole issue under consideration is whether the petitioner submitted a redetermination application for continued benefits under the provisions of N.J.A.C. 10:71-5.1. This is a termination of benefits and thus, the burden on the agency is to demonstrate, by a preponderance of the credible evidence, that the petitioner failed to file the redetermination application and to whom this application applied. However, the agency was unable to provide any clarification as to whether this matter applied to just P.W., the petitioner's son, or to her daughter as well. The petitioner provided credible testimony regarding the confusion surrounding this issue, as well as issues about the redetermination application. The respondent provided testimony about needing additional income documents yet also testified that no redetermination application had been submitted. Why was there an income evaluation if there was no redetermination application filed? Ms. Cole's testimony was also inconsistent with the documentation provided that indicated that S.W. had in fact been approved for benefits and documentation received in September and October of 2024.

I therefore **CONCLUDE** that respondent has failed to meet their burden of demonstrating that the petitioner, and her children, were terminated for failure to submit a redetermination application. I further **CONCLUDE** that the termination is reversed and the petitioner's appeal is **GRANTED**.

ORDER


Based upon the foregoing, the determination of the respondent is **REVERSED** as to its determination to terminate the petitioner's eligibility in the NJ Medicaid program.

I **FILE** my initial decision with the **ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF THE DIVISION OF MEDICAL ASSISTANCE AND HEALTH SERVICES** for consideration. This recommended decision may be adopted, modified, or rejected by the **ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER**, who is authorized to make a final decision in this case. If the **ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER** does not adopt, modify, or reject this decision within forty-five days, and unless such time limit is otherwise extended, this recommended decision becomes a final decision under N.J.S.A. 52:14B-10(c).

Within seven days from the date on which this recommended decision is mailed to the parties, any party may file written exceptions at **ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER, DIVISION OF MEDICAL ASSISTANCE AND HEALTH SERVICES, Mail Code #3, PO Box 712, Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0712**, marked "Attention: Exceptions." A copy of any exceptions must be sent to the judge and to the other parties.

October 17, 2025

DATE


SARAH G. CROWLEY, ALJ

Date Received at Agency:

Date Mailed to Parties:

SGC/lam/onl

APPENDIX

Witnesses

For petitioner

S.W.

For respondent

Judith Coles

Exhibits

For petitioner

None

For respondent

R-1 Packet from the Board