

## GRIEVANCE PROCESS - GRIEVABILITY

[NOTE: The decisions cited in this section of the digest have to do with whether or not a specific issue can be brought as a grievance.]

---

### DECISIONS

1. The DHS 94 grievance process has **no jurisdiction over issues raised by an individual under the control of the Department of Corrections**. The individual was redirected to appeal through the DOC inmate complaint system. (Level III decision in Case No. 98-SGE-01 on 2/6/98.)
2. A patient's **ex-husband attempted to file a grievance** on his ex-wife's behalf about the **fees charged for her mental health services**. He had been ordered by the divorce court to pay that bill. He **lacked standing to bring the complaint or appeal it through the grievance process without his ex-wife's consent**. **Patient rights attached to her, not her ex-husband**, since she was the one receiving the treatment. (Level III decision in Case No. 00-SGE-06 on 4/14/00.)
3. A patient being **emergency detained** complained about **being shackled** by the **sheriff officers during transport**. This is their standard practice. The **grievance process has no jurisdiction over the actions of law enforcement agencies**. (Level III decision in Case No. 00-SGE-04 on 4/9/01.)
4. **Financial assistance for housing is not an issue covered by client rights** and such decisions **cannot be challenged in the grievance process** in DHS 94. (Level III decision in Case No. 01-SGE-02 on 6/6/01.)
5. A client **also filed a complaint** with the Department of Health and Family Services **Bureau of Quality Assurance (BQA)**, which certifies providers and clinics. The issues raised in that context were reviewed as part of a separate process. The **grievance procedure reviews complaints in the context of DHS 94 rights**, and **does not deal with licensing or certification issues**. Thus, **there is no standing to raise licensing and certification issues in the grievance process**, too. (Level IV decision in Case No. 00-SGE-11 on 8/26/02, upholding the Level III decision.)
6. An ex-patient complained that an inpatient treatment facility **overcharged** him for some smoking materials. **County funds paid for those materials**, rather than the patient. The issue was thus between the county and the facility and the issue was **not appropriate for the grievance process**. (Level III decision in Case No. 02-SGE-05 on 3/19/03.)

7. A father **wanted to audio-tape staff's meetings** where they discussed his son's treatment. The **facility refused to allow this**. This is **not a patient rights issue**. The only relevant patient right is the right **not** to be filmed or taped. The facility offered to write up the outcomes of the meetings for the father. This was a reasonable resolution, but the father refused to accept it. (Level III decision in Case No. 03-SGE-03 on 7/17/03)
8. A **court decision to order medications cannot be challenged in the grievance process**. (Level III decision in Case No. 03-SGE-10 on 10/23/03.)
9. **Sheltered workshops** that have been **approved by DWD** [or the federal Department of Labor] to **pay sub-minimum wages** are, by such approval, deemed in compliance with the client wage requirements of § 51.61(1)(b), Stats. The DHS 94 grievance procedure has **no jurisdiction** over issues of **compliance** with the **federal Fair Labor Standards Act**. (Level IV decision in Case No. 04-SGE-04 on 11/11/04)
10. A **diagnosis** made by an independent, outpatient clinician was that **clinician's opinion**, which **cannot be challenged** in the **grievance process**. The client has the right to get a second opinion if she disagrees with the diagnosis. (Level IV decision in Case No. 06-SGE-09 on 9/27/06)
11. A man whose adult son had been protectively placed with him as an Adult Family Home provider **requested to be reimbursed** from the county for the "respite" hours and mileage he had provided when the assigned respite staff did not show up to take his son out. That issue is **not grievable** as a client rights issue. Rather, it is an issue between the provider/father and the county to work out. (Level IV Decision in Case No. 06-SGE-03 on 9/01/10)
12. A client complained about a **clinic policy that did not affect him** personally, so he **lacked standing** to bring this issue. However, it was determined that the issue **would be reviewed** since it **had significant importance to other patients**. (Level III decision in Case No. 10-SGE-13 on 3/03/11)
13. The grievants filed a complaint on behalf of their granddaughter. The grievants claimed that the provider falsely accused the grievants of refusing medication on behalf of their granddaughter, not understanding medical opinion and not acting in the best interest of their granddaughter. They also accused the provider of including inaccurate information in the protective placement comprehensive report filed with the court. As the grievants were essentially asking CRO to overturn a valid court order removing guardianship from the grievants, something which CRO is unable to do, the case was dismissed. (Level III Grievance Decision in Case No. 19-SGE-03)
14. A patient filed a grievance regarding his treatment services three to five years after the services had ended. The patient was well beyond the 45 day timeframe to file a grievance, and did not provide evidence to support his reasoning for the delay in

filing the grievance. The grievance was accepted at Level I-A and I-B, however, after a review of the grievant's medical records, it was determined there was not enough evidence to support the allegations in the grievance that would establish "good cause" to fully investigate the each issue. Therefore, the case was dismissed. (Level III Grievance Decision in Case No. 19-SGE-05)

[See: "Introduction to Digest-Date Last Updated" page]