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

(35)

IN	THE	MAT.	TER	OE:
117	INE			OF.

IN THE MATTER OF:		
	Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	201210948 3019 December 21, 2011 Wayne County DHS
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Andrea J. Bradl	еу	
HEARING DECIS	<u>ION</u>	
This matter is before the undersigned Administrative and MCL 400.37 following Claimant's request of telephone hearing was held on December 22 Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant of Department of Human Services (Eligibility Specialist, and Ms. Reynolds, Assistance)	or a hearing. 21, 2011, from aimant, Department) inc	After due notice, a Detroit, Michigan. Participants luded Ms. English,
<u>ISSUE</u>		
Due to excess assets, did the Department properl ☐ close Claimant's case for:	y 🗌 deny the Cl	aimant's application
Family Independence Program (FIP)? Medical Assistance (MA)? Food Assistance Program (FAP)?		Assistance (AMP)? Assistance (SDA)?
FINDINGS OF FA	<u>ACT</u>	
The Administrative Law Judge, based on the cevidence on the whole record, including the testime fact:	•	
1. Claimant ☐ applied for benefits ☒ received be	nefits for:	
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP). ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐		Assistance (AMP). Assistance (SDA).

2. Due to excess assets, on October 25, 2011, the Department

201210948/AJB ☐ denied Claimant's application. ☐ closed Claimant's case.
 On October 25, 2011, the Department sent ☐ Claimant ☐ Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the ☐ denial. ☐ closure.
 On November 3, 2011, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the ☐ denial of the application. ☐ closure of the case.
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).
☐ The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is administered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, <i>et seq</i> .
☐ 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.
Model 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, <i>et seq.</i> , 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 (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MCL 400.105.
☐ The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department (formerly known

Additionally, the Department policy states that the asset limit for FAP program benefits is \$5,000 and the asset limit for the MA program is \$3,000. BEM 400. A person's homestead is excluded from the asset test. BEM 400. A homestead is where a person lives that he owns, is buying or holds through a life estate or life lease. It includes the home, all adjoining land and any other buildings on the land. Adjoining land means land which is not completely separated from the home by land owned by someone else.

as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL

400.10, et seq., and 2000 AACS, Rule 400.3151 through Rule 400.3180.

201210948/AJB

Adjoining land may be separated by rivers, easements and public rights-of-way. BEM 400.

In this case, the Claimant presented credible and unrebutted testimony that the second property, which was considered by the Department to be an asset, is adjoining parcel of land to the Claimant's first parcel where his home is located. The second parcel contains the Claimant's garage and is not in any way separated by a home or land of another person. To that end, the first and second parcel is excluded as assets based on the homestead exception. Under these facts, the Department failed to establish that it acted in accordance with Department policy when it terminated the Claimant's FAP and MA benefits based on excess assets.

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, due to excess assets, the Department improperly denied Claimant's application properly denied Claimant's application properly closed Claimant's case improperly closed Claimant's case for: \square AMP \square FIP \boxtimes MA \square SDA \boxtimes FAP. **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 \square AMP \square FIP \boxtimes MA \square SDA \boxtimes FAP decision is ☐ AFFIRMED ☐ REVERSED for the reasons stated 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. The Department shall remove the negative action dated October 25, 2011 and

reinstate the Claimant's FAP and MA benefits in accordance with Department policy.

2. The Department shall supplement the Claimant for lost benefits he was eligibile and otherwise qualified to receive but-for the October 25, 2011 negative case action.

Andrea J. Bradley
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: <u>1/5/2012</u>

Date Mailed: 1/5/2012

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.

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 <u>MAY</u> 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

AJB/hw

Wayne County DHS

A. Bradley
Administrative Hearings

4