


**STATE OF MICHIGAN
MICHIGAN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING SYSTEM
ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES**



IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 201150496
Issue No.: 1021; 2018; 4008
Case No.: 
Hearing Date: November 21, 2011
County: Oakland (02)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Alice C. Elkin

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 following Claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on November 21, 2011, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant and  Claimant's Easter Seal case manager. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included  Eligibility Specialist.

ISSUE

Did the Department properly deny Claimant's application close Claimant's case for:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP)? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP)? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA)? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC)? |

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

1. Claimant applied for benefits received benefits for:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP). | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP). |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP). | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA). |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA). | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC). |

2. On May 24, 2011, the Department
 denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's case
due to failure to Claimant's failure to meet eligibility requirements.
3. On May 24, 2011, the Department sent
 Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)
notice of the denial. closure.
4. On August 17, 2011, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the
 denial of the application. closure of the case.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Department policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 42 USC 601, *et seq.* The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 1999 AC, Rule 400.3101 through Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996.

The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) program] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 1999 AC, Rule 400.3001 through Rule 400.3015.

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105.

The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is administered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 2000 AAC, Rule 400.3151 through Rule 400.3180.

□ The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE and XX of the Social Security Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 1990, and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. The program is implemented by Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 98 and 99. The Department provides services to adults and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and 1999 AC, Rule 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.

Additionally, in this case, Claimant applied for cash and medical assistance on May 10, 2011. On May 24, 2011, the Department sent Claimant a Notice of Case Action denying her application on the basis that she was not eligible for FIP, MA, SDA, or AMP benefits.

In order to be eligible for cash assistance under FIP, the group at issue must include a dependent child who lives with a legal parent, stepparent or other qualifying caretaker. BEM 210. Individuals who are not eligible for FIP and who are disabled or the caretaker of a disabled person are eligible for SDA.

An individual may receive Medical Assistance (MA) coverage if the individual qualifies under an a FIP-related MA category or an SSI-related MA category. To receive MA under an SSI-related category, the person must be aged (65 or older), blind, disabled, entitled to Medicare or formerly blind or disabled. BEM 105. To receive MA under a FIP-related category, the person must have dependent children, be a caretaker relative of dependent children, or be under age 21 and pregnant or recently pregnant. BEM 105. AMP provides limited medical services for persons not eligible for MA coverage. BEM 100.

At the hearing, Claimant admitted that she was not over 65 years old, not blind, not the parent or relative caretaker of a minor child, not pregnant, and lived alone in her home. Thus, the Department properly concluded that she did not qualify for FIP or FIP-related MA. The Department also properly concluded that Claimant was not eligible for AMP medical coverage because the program was closed to new enrollees at the time of her application.

Claimant contended, however, that she was entitled to cash assistance and medical assistance based on her significant medical issues. While Claimant testified that she had medical records dating from 2005 diagnosing her with a debilitating disease, she acknowledged that she had not provided the Department with any of this information at the time she applied for benefits. She also acknowledged that she had not indicated on her application that she was disabled or provided the Department with any indication that she had any sort of medical issue. Because the Department did not have any notice of Claimant's medical issue, it could not approve her application for SSI-related MA coverage or SDA benefits, or initiate the process for medical approval of these benefits, on the basis of a disability. See BEM 260; BEM 261. While Claimant was frustrated because she believed the application did not clearly instruct her to declare her medical issues and she was unable to get her caseworker to respond to repeated

phone calls, she conceded that the Department acted appropriately under the circumstances in this case.

Based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department

properly denied Claimant's application improperly denied Claimant's application
 properly closed Claimant's case improperly closed Claimant's case

for: AMP FIP FAP MA SDA CDC.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, finds that the Department

did act properly. did not act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's AMP FIP FAP MA SDA CDC decision is AFFIRMED REVERSED for the reasons stated above and on the record.

THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO DO THE FOLLOWING WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER:

1.



Alice C. Elkin
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: December 8, 2011

Date Mailed: December 8, 2011

NOTICE: Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS) may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a party within 30 days of the mailing date of this Decision and Order. MAHS will not order a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's motion where the final decision cannot be implemented within 90 days of the filing of the original request. (60 days for FAP cases)

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

Claimant may request a rehearing or reconsideration for the following reasons:

- A rehearing **MAY** be granted if there is newly discovered evidence that could affect the outcome of the original hearing decision.
- A reconsideration **MAY** be granted for any of the following reasons:
 - misapplication of manual policy or law in the hearing decision,
 - typographical errors, mathematical error, or other obvious errors in the hearing decision that effect the substantial rights of the claimant:
 - the failure of the ALJ to address other relevant issues in the hearing decision.

Request must be submitted through the local DHS office or directly to MAHS by mail at

Michigan Administrative Hearings

Reconsideration/Rehearing Request

P. O. Box 30639

Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

ACE/ctl

cc:

[REDACTED]

Oakland County DHS (02)

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

A.

Elkin