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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 201222811

Issue No.: 3002

Case No.:

Hearing Date: February 1, 2012 County: Monroe County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Christopher S. Saunders

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 February 1, 2012 from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included

ISSUE

Due to excess income, did the Department properly \square deny the Claimant's application \square close Claimant's case \boxtimes reduce Claimant's benefits for:			
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)? ☐ 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 for:	received benefits for:		
 ☐ Family Independence Program (FIP). ☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP). ☐ Medical Assistance (MA). 	☐ Adult Medical Assistance (AMP).☐ State Disability Assistance (SDA).☐ Child Development and Care (CDC).		

2.	On December 1, 2011, the Department denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's case reduced Claimant's benefits due to excess income.		
3.	On December 13, 2011, the Department sent Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the denial. closure. reduction.		
4.	On December 28, 2011, Claimant or Claimant's AHR filed a hearing request, protesting the \square denial of the application. \square closure of the case. \square reduction of benefits.		
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW		
Department policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).			
ad	The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is ministered 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, <i>et seq.</i> The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, <i>et seq.</i> , and 1999 AC, R 400.3101 through Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996.			
pro imp Re Ag	The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) ogram] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is plemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal egulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence ency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, R 400.3001 ough Rule 400.3015.		
Se Th	The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social curity Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). e Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the A program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MCL 400.105.		
for as	The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department (formerly known the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 0.10, et seq., and 2000 AACS, R 400.3151 through Rule 400.3180.		
	The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE d 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, R 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.

Additionally, on her hearing request, the claimant stated that she was requesting a hearing for her FAP benefits as well as for her application for State Emergency Relief (SER). However, at the time the claimant filed her hearing request, the department had not taken any action pertaining to the claimant's SER application.

MAC 400.903 lays out instances where recipients of assistance have a right to an administrative hearing within the Michigan DHS. This rule specifies when an opportunity for a hearing shall be granted:

An opportunity for a hearing shall be granted to an applicant who requests a hearing because his claim for assistance is denied or is not acted upon with reasonable promptness, and to any recipient who is aggrieved by an agency action resulting in suspension, reduction, discontinuance, or termination of assistance. MAC 400.903(1).

At the time of the claimant's hearing request, the department had not taken any action to suspend, reduce, discontinue or terminate the claimant's SER benefits. Under the administrative rule discussed above, claimant does not have a right to a hearing and thus, this Administrative Law Judge has no jurisdiction in this matter. Accordingly, the portion of the claimant's hearing request pertaining to the SER application is dismissed.

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 income, the Department $\ oxedsymbol{oxed}$ properly $\ oxedsymbol{\Box}$ improperly		
 ☐ denied Claimant's application ☐ reduced Claimant's benefits ☐ closed Claimant's case 		
for:		
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 \infty did not act properly.		

	e Department's	FIP 🔀 FAP 🗌 MA 🔲 SDA 🔲 CDC decision asons stated on the record.
		/S/
		Christopher S. Saunders
		Administrative Law Judge
		For Maura Corrigan, Director
		Department of Human Services
Date Signed:	February 2, 2012	
Date Mailed:	February 2, 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

CSS/cr

cc: