

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 201215976  
Issue No.: 2001; 2013  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: April 25, 2012  
County: Wayne (49)

**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 April 25, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant and [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED] Eligibility Specialist.

**ISSUE**

With respect to the Adult Medical Assistance (AMP) Program, did the Department properly  deny Claimant's application?  close Claimant's case?

**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  was a recipient of AMP benefits.
2. Claimant  was  was not living with a spouse during the time period in question.
3. The total countable income of Claimant's household was \$536 at all times relevant to this matter.
4. The Department  denied Claimant's application  closed Claimant's case due to excess income.

5. On September 15, 2011, the Department sent notice of the  denial  closure to Claimant.
6. On October 18, 2011, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the  denial of the application.  closure of the case.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is administered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.* Department policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

Additionally, in connection with Claimant's AMP redetermination, which considered Claimant's income for August 2011, the Department learned that Claimant was receiving unemployment income. Based on its finding that Claimant's income exceeded the AMP income limit, the Department closed Claimant's AMP case effective October 1, 2011.

Income eligibility for AMP coverage exists when the AMP group's net income does not exceed the group's AMP income limit. BEM 640. The AMP income limit for Claimant, an individual in an independent living arrangement, is \$316. RFT 236.

In determining Claimant's income eligibility for continued participation in AMP, the Department must consider the gross amount of unemployment benefits received. BEM 503. In this case, Claimant received biweekly gross unemployment benefits of \$268, which he verified at the hearing. Because unemployment benefits are unearned income (BEM 503), Claimant is not entitled to the gross earnings deduction under BEM 640 in connection with these benefits. Thus, Claimant's monthly income for August 2011 based on his biweekly income was \$536. BEM 530. Although the Department testified that it relied on monthly income of \$576.20 in determining Claimant's AMP eligibility, this error was harmless. Because Claimant's monthly gross income of \$536 exceeded the AMP income limit of \$316, the Department acted in accordance with Department policy when it closed Claimant's AMP case effective October 1, 2011.

At the hearing, the Department testified that Claimant had reapplied for AMP coverage on September 21, 2011, but his application was denied because the program was closed to new enrollees at the time of his application. The Department credibly testified at the hearing that there was a freeze for AMP enrollment. Although the Department did not indicate whether Claimant was eligible for coverage under other Medical Assistance (MA) programs, a review of Claimant's application shows that he did not indicate that he was aged (65 or older), under age 21, disabled, or the parent or caretaker of a minor child. Accordingly, he was not eligible under any other MA programs. BEM 105; BEM 640.

Based on the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for 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.

**DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based on 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 decision is  AFFIRMED  REVERSED for the reasons stated above and on the record.



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

Date Signed: April 27, 2012

Date Mailed: April 27, 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 mailing 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.

2012-15976/ACE

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

Michigan Administrative Hearings  
Re consideration/Rehearing Request  
P. O. Box 30639  
Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

ACE/cl

cc:

