# STATE OF MICHIGAN <br> MICHIGAN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING SYSTEM ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES 

## IN THE MATTER OF THE CLAIM OF:



Reg No.: 201121512
Issue No.: 2000 Case No. Load No.: Hearing Date: May 18, 2011 Macomb County DHS (20)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Susan C. Burke

## HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administ rative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400. 9 and MCL 400.37 upon the Claim ant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on May 18, 2011. The Claimant was present and testified. Claimant's mother, also testified on behalf of Claimant. The Department of Human Services (Department) was represented by

## ISSUE

Was the Department correct in closing Claimant's Adult Medical Program (AMP) case?

## FINDINGS OF FACT

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

1. Claimant was an ongoing recipient of AMP.
2. The Department closed Claimant's AMP case, effective January 1, 2011.
3. Clamant requested a hearing protesting the negative action.
4. At the hearing, $t$ he Department agreed to reinstate Claim ant's AMP case effective January 1, 2011.
5. As a result of the agreement, Claimant indicated that he no longer wished to proceed with the hearing.

## CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by Title XXI of the Social Security Act; (1115)(a)(1) of the Social Se curity Act, and is administered by the Department of Human Services (formerly known as $t$ he Family Independenc e Agency) pursuant to MCL 400.10 et seq. Department policies are containe $d$ in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Program Referenc e Manual (PRM,) which includes the Reference Tables (RFT.)

Under Bridges Administrative Manual Item 600, c lients have the right to contest any agency decision affecting eligibility or benefit levels whenever they believe the decision is illegal. The Dep artment provides an Administrative Hearing $t$ o review $t$ he decis ion and determine if it is appropriate. Department policy includes procedures to meet the minimal requirements for a fair hearing. Efforts to clarif $y$ and resolve the client's concerns start when the Department receiv es a hearing request and continues through the day of the hearing.

In the present case the Department has agreed to reinstate Cla imant's AMP case, effective January 1, 2011. As a result of this agreement, Claimant indic ated he n o longer wis hed to proceed wit $h$ the hearing. Since $t$ he Claimant and the Department have come to an agreement, it is unneces sary for this Administ rative Law Judge to make a decision regarding the facts and issues in this case

## DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon $t$ he above findings of fact and conclusion s of law dec ides that the D epartment and Claimant hav e come to a settlement regarding Claimant's request for a heari ng. Therefore, it is O RDERED that the Department reinstate Claimant's AMP case, effective January 1, 2011.

Susan C. Burke<br>Administrative Law Judge<br>For Maura Corrigan, Director<br>Department of Human Services

Date Signed: May 25, 2011
Date Mailed: May 25, 2011

NOTICE: Administrative Hearings may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a party wit hin 30 days of the ma iling date of this Decision and Order. Administrative Hear ings will $n$ ot order a rehearing o reconsideration on the Department's mo tion where the final decis ion cannot be implemented within 90 days of the filing of the original request.

The Claimant may appeal the Decision and Order to Circuit Court within 30 days of the mailing of the Decis ion and Order or, if a ti mely request for rehearing was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the rehearing decision.
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