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:	201228314 2026 March 15, 2012 Eaton County DHS
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Christophe	er S. Saunders	
HEARING D	ECISION	
This matter is before the undersigned Administration and MCL 400.37 following Claimant's required telephone hearing was held on March 15, 20 on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Human Services (Department) included	lest for a hearing. 012, from Lansing, M	After due notice, a ichigan. Participants
ISSU	<u>lE</u>	
Did the Department properly deny Claima for:	ant's application 🛛 c	lose Claimant's case
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)? ☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)? ☐ Medical Assistance (MA)?	State Disability A	ssistance (AMP)? Assistance (SDA)? ent 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:

 Claimant ☐ applied fo 	r benefits X received	benefits for:
☐ Family Independer☐ Food Assistance P☐ Medical Assistance	rogram (FAP).	Adult Medical Assistance (AMP). State Disability Assistance (SDA). Child Development and Care (CDC).

	On December 27, 2011, the Department denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's case due to excess income and assigned the claimant a spend down.
	On December 16, 2011, the Department sent Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the denial. Closure.
4. (On December 27, 2011, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the denial of the application. closure of the case.
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
she Prog clair she bene	a preliminary matter, the claimant had initially indicated on her hearing request that was requesting a hearing regarding her MA benefits as well as her Food Assistance gram (FAP) benefits. However, prior to the closure of the hearing record, the mant stated that the department had properly adjusted her FAP benefits and that did not wish to proceed with the portion of her hearing pertaining to her FAP efits. Therefore, the portion of this hearing pertaining to the claimant's FAP benefits ereby dismissed.
	partment policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the lges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).
Res 42 l Age thro	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, R 400.3101 augh Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program ctive October 1, 1996.
prog impl Reg Age	The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) gram] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is lemented 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, R 400.3001 augh Rule 400.3015.
Sec The Age	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). Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence ency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MCL .105.
	The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is ninistered 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, <i>et seq.</i> , and 2000 AACS, R 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, R 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.
Additionally, in the case at hand, the department representative testified that the claimant was assigned a group sixe of 2, when it was determined that the clamant should have been assigned a group sixe of 3. The department could not provide an explanation for why the claimant's group size was listed at 2. Therefore, the department did not use the proper group size to determine if the claimant was over the income limit and was required to be assigned a spend down.
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 denied Claimant's application □ properly closed Claimant's case □ improperly denied Claimant's application □ improperly 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 did act properly.
Accordingly, the Department's \square AMP \square FIP \square FAP \boxtimes MA \square SDA \square CDC decision is \square AFFIRMED \boxtimes 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:

Re-determine the claimant's eligibility for MA benefits using the proper group size and any appropriate deductions that may be available to the claimant.

/s/

Christopher S. Saunders Administrative Law Judge For Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: March 15, 2012

Date Mailed: March 16, 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:

