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

IN THE MATTER OF:		
	Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	2012-22826 3002 January 30, 2012 Oakland (63-03)
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Alice C. Elkin		
HEARING DECI	<u>SION</u>	
This matter is before the undersigned Administrat and MCL 400.37 following Claimant's request telephone hearing was held on January 30, 2012 on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Partici Human Services (Department) included ISSUE	for a hearing. t, from Detroit, Mi	After due notice, a chigan. Participants
Due to excess income, did the Department prope ☐ close Claimant's case ☒ reduce Claimant's be		laimant's application
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)? ☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)? ☐ Medical Assistance (MA)? ☐		sistance (AMP)? ssistance (SDA)? nt and Care (CDC)?
FINDINGS OF F	ACT	
The Administrative Law Judge, based on the evidence on the whole record, finds as material fa	- ·	rial, and substantial
1. Claimant ☐ applied for benefits for: ☐ re	ceived benefits fo	r:
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP). ☐ ☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP). ☐ ☐ Medical Assistance (MA). ☐	-	ssistance (AMP). Assistance (SDA). ent and Care (CDC).

2.	On January 1, 2012, the Department
3.	On December 17, 2011, the Department sent Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the denial. closure. reduction.
4.	On December 21, 2011, Claimant or Claimant's AHR filed a hearing request, protesting the denial of the application. Closure of the case. reduction of benefits.
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
	partment policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the dges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).
	The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is ministered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq.
Re 42 Ag thr	The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal sponsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence ency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, Rule 400.3101 ough Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program ective 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 olemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal gulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence ency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, Rule 0.3001 through 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, Rule 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, Rule 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.

Additionally, at the hearing, the Department testified that Claimant's FAP benefits were reduced to \$57 effective January 1, 2012, based on an increase in Claimant's unearned income. Claimant verified that his FAP group size was one and that, based on the information the Department had at the time it calculated his January 2012 FAP budget, it properly used a monthly rental obligation of \$730. The Department testified that Claimant's gross unearned income for January 2013 was \$1,557, which was consistent with Claimant's letter from the Social Security Administration showing an increase in his gross monthly Retirement, Survivors, and Disability Insurance (RSDI) benefits to \$1,566.90 effective January 2012. Claimant, as a Senior/Disabled/Veteran (SDV) member, is entitled to a deduction for monthly medical expenses in excess of \$35, and based on the expenses available to the Department, the Department properly calculated Claimant's medical expense deduction as \$248. BEM 554. A review of Claimant's FAP budget based on the foregoing figures shows that the Department determined Claimant's monthly FAP benefits of \$57 effective January 1, 2012, in accordance with Department policy. BEM 554; BEM 556; RFT 255. While Claimant testified that he had increases in his monthly housing expenses and medical insurance premiums, he admitted that he had not presented evidence of these increases to the Department prior to the hearing date.

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 \square properly \square 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 \square did not act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's \square AMP \square FIP \boxtimes FAP \square MA \square SDA \square CDC decision is \boxtimes AFFIRMED \square 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: February 1, 2012

Date Mailed: February 1, 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 <u>MAY</u> 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

ACE/pf

CC:
Goddard
A. Elkin