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

### IN THE MATTER OF:

2012-19189 Reg. No.: Issue No.: 2021 Case No.: January 26, 2012 Hearing Date: County: Macomb (36)

### ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Michael J. Bennane

# **HEARING DECISION**

This matter is before the undersigned Administ rative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 following Claim ant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on J anuary 26, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participant s on behalf of Claimant included claimant and Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included

### ISSUE

Due to excess assets, did the Department properly  $\square$  deny the Claimant's app lication close Claimant's case for:



Family Independence Program (FIP)? Medical Assistance (MA)?

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

# FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based on t he competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, i ncluding the test imony at the hearing, finds as material fact:

1. Cla imant 🖂 applied for benefits 🗌 received benefits for:



Family Independence Program (FIP). Medical Assistance (MA).

Adult Medical Assistance (AMP). State Disability Assistance (SDA).

2.	Due to excess assets, on October	18, 2011, the Department
	denied Claimant's application.	closed Claimant's case.

- On November 3, 2011, the Department sent
  ☐ Claimant ☐ Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the ☐ denial. ☐ closure.
- 4. On October 26, 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 (A	ΜP) is ε	established by 42	USC 1315, and is
administered by the Department	pursuant to MC	CL 400.10, et seq.	

☐ The Family Independence Progr am (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and W ork Opportunity Reconc iliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 42 USC 601, *et seq*. The Department (formerly k nown 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 Ass istance (MA) program is es tablished by the Title XIX of the Soc ial Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the F amily Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105.

The State Disabilit y Assistance (SDA) progr am, which provides financial ass istance for disabled persons, is establis hed by 2004 PA 344. The Department (formerly known as the F amily Independence Agency) admini sters the SDA program pursuant to M CL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 2000 AACS, Rule 400.3151 through Rule 400.3180.

Additionally, on the claimant's application he listed assets that were above the allowed limit.

Based upon the abov e Findings of Fact and Conclus ions 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 of
properly closed Claimant's case	improperly of

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

for: 🗌 AMP 🗌 FIP 🖾 MA 🗌 SE	)A.
----------------------------	-----

### **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  $\square$  did act properly.  $\square$  did not act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's  $\square$  AMP  $\square$  FIP  $\boxtimes$  MA  $\square$  SDA decision is  $\boxtimes$  AFFIRMED  $\square$  REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.

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

Date Signed: February 22, 2012

Date Mailed: February 22, 2012

**NOTICE:** Michigan Administrative Hearing S ystem (MAHS) may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a par ty within 30 days of the mailing date of this Dec ision and Order . MAHS will not or der a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's mo tion where the final decis ion 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 ti mely 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

consideration/Rehearing Request

P. O. Box 30639 Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

MJB/cl

Re

# 201-19189/MJB

