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

#### IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2012-17923 2018, 3019, 4070 Issue Nos.: Case No.: April 12, 2012 Hearing Date: Macomb (50-20) County:

## ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Jan Leventer

## **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 12, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included

#### ISSUE

Did the Department properly  $\Box$  deny Claimant's application  $\boxtimes$  close Claimant's case for:

imes	
$\times$	
$\sim$	

State SSI Payment (SSP)? Food Assistance Program (FAP)?

Medical Assistance (MA)?

Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)? State Disability Assistance (SDA)? 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:

Х
$\times$

State SSI Payment (SSP).

Food Assistance Program (FAP). Medical Assistance (MA).

Adult Medical Assistance (AMP).

State Disability Assistance (SDA).

Child Development and Care (CDC).

2012-17923/JL

- On October 1, 2011, the Department

   denied Claimant's application
   closed Claimant's case
   due to Claimant's transfer to the Retirement, Survivors and Disability Insurance
   (RSDI) program from the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) program.
- On November 18, 2011, the Department sent
   ☐ Claimant ☐ Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the ☐ denial. ☐ closure.
- 4. On November 28, 2011, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the  $\Box$  denial of the application.  $\boxtimes$  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 State SSI Program (SSP) is established by 42 USC 1382e and 20 CFR 416, 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 AACS, 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, it is undisputed that Claimant's federal SSI benefits ended on or about September 30, 2011, and her federal RSDI benefits began October 1, 2011. It is found and determined that Claimant's change in status from SSI to RSDI caused the following two events to occur: first, Claimant's eligibility for SSP, which is a State program that supplements federal SSI benefits, ended on September 30, 2011, when she stopped receiving SSI from the Social Security Administration. Second, at the same time, her eligibility for the State Medicaid program for disabled SSI recipients ended, and she was automatically moved into another state Medicaid program, "P," which is "Medicaid for the disabled."

It is found and determined, therefore, that the Department acted correctly in closing Claimant's SSP benefits and in terminating Claimant's Medicaid coverage for disabled SSI recipients and initiating her into the Medicaid coverage program "P" for disabled persons. The Department is affirmed as to these actions.

Third, with regard to Claimant's termination from the FAP program, the Department presented no evidence to show why Claimant was terminated from the FAP program. Claimant's FAP ended November 30, 2011, and in December she lost \$22 in FAP benefits for the period of December 1-8, 2011. She was reinstated to the program on December 9, 2011, and received a prorated amount of \$108 in December, and not her monthly allotment of \$130.

Because of lack of evidence presented as to this question, the Department failed to meet its burden of proof to establish the correctness of its action, and a reversal is necessary in order to ensure the Claimant receives all FAP benefits to which she is entitled. With regard to the FAP termination, the Department is reversed.

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 closed Claimant's MA and SSP cases and ➢ improperly closed Claimant's FAP case.

# 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  $\Box$  did act properly with regard to MA and SSP and  $\Box$  did not not properly with regard to  $\Box$   $\Box$ 

 $\boxtimes$  did not act properly with regard to FAP

Accordingly, the Department's decision regarding MA and SSP is AFFIRMED and regarding FAP is 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. Initiate procedures to review the Department's failure to pay Claimant's FAP benefits from December 1-8, 2011;
- 2. If appropriate, initiate procedures to pay supplemental FAP benefits to Claimant to restore her to the benefit level to which she is entitled.
- 3. All steps shall be taken in accordance with Department policy and procedure.

Jan goen len

Jan Leventer Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: April 17, 2012

Date Mailed: April 17, 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 <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

JL/pf

