

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2012 17840  
Issue No.: 2023  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: March 1, 2012  
County: Oakland County DHS (03)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Lynn M. Ferris

**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 March 1, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant and the Claimant's Authorized Hearing Representative, [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED].

**ISSUE**

Due to excess assets, did the Department properly  deny the Claimant's application  close Claimant's case for:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP)?  | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)?    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA)? | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA)? |

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

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

1. Claimant  applied for benefits  received benefits for:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP).  | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP).    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA). | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA). |

2. Due to excess assets, on September 2, 2011, the Department  denied Claimant's application.  closed Claimant's case.

3. On September 20, 2011, the Department sent  
 Claimant       Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)  
notice of the       denial.     closure.
4. On September 20, 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, *et seq.*

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 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 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.

Additionally, the Claimant applied for MA - P (disability) retro to March 2010. The Department reviewed bank statements and the Claimant's Roth IRA, and determined that for each month examined the Claimant's assets exceeded the \$2000 asset limit. (Exhibit 1). The Roth IRA was valued at \$2707.47 at the time of the evaluation and the Department used the lowest daily balance for the checking account for each month. For each of the months's evaluated, the Claimant's assets exceeded the \$2000 limit. Exhibit 1. BEM 400, page 20 provides the basis for valuing the retirement assets and states:

The value of these plans is the amount of money the person can currently withdraw from the plan. Deduct any early withdrawal penalty, but not the amount of any taxes due.

Based on the foregoing policy it is determined that the Department correctly determined that the Claimant's assets exceeded \$2000. Although the claimant's Authorized Hearing Representative indicated that there was a withdrawal penalty, no evidence, other than her statement that the penalty is usually 10%, was offered. Even assuming the penalty was applicable, deducting 10% of the IRA amount does not reduce the asset to \$2000 or less. Therefore, it is concluded that the Department correctly denied the Claimant's application.

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

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

for:     AMP     FIP     MA     SDA.

**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  MA  SDA 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:



\_\_\_\_\_  
Lynn M. Ferris  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: March 7, 2012

Date Mailed: March 7, 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. (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 to:

Michigan Administrative hearings  
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request  
P. O. Box 30639  
Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

LMF/hw

cc:

