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

IN	TH	MΛ.	TT		$\mathbf{a}$	
ПV		VI /~		ᄗ		Г.

	Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Dates: County:	2012-32464 3002 March 8 and 9, 2012 Wayne (82-18)				
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Jan Levente	ır					
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 March 8 and March 9, 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 ⊠ reduce Claimant's application ☐ close Claimant's case for:						
<ul><li>☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)?</li><li>☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)?</li><li>☐ Medical Assistance (MA)?</li></ul>		sistance (AMP)? ssistance (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 for benefits ☒ received	. Claimant ☐ applied for benefits ⊠ received benefits for:					
<ul> <li>☐ Family Independence Program (FIP).</li> <li>☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP).</li> <li>☐ Medical Assistance (MA).</li> </ul>		ssistance (AMP). Assistance (SDA). ent and Care (CDC).				

2.	. On February 1, 2012, the Department ⊠ reduced Claimant's benefit level based on his gross earnings	] closed Claimant's case
3.	. On January 30, 2012, the Department sent ⊠ Claimant ☐ Claimant's Authorized I notice of the ☐ reduction. ☐ closure	
4.	. On February 8, 2012, Claimant filed a heari ⊠ reduction of benefits. ☐ closure of the	
	CONCLUSIONS	S OF LAW
	epartment policies are contained in the Bri ridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Refe	• , ,
Re 42 Ag thr	The Family Independence Program (FIP) versions and Work Opportunity Reconci 2 USC 601, et seq. The Department (form gency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400 arough Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid ffective October 1, 1996.	liation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, erly known as the Family Independence 10, et seq., and 1999 AC, Rule 400.3101
pro im Re Ag	The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [forogram] is established by the Food Stamplemented by the federal regulations contactegulations (CFR). The Department (formet gency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 00.3001 through Rule 400.3015.	np Act of 1977, as amended, and is ained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal rly known as the Family Independence
Se Th Ag	The Medical Assistance (MA) program is elecurity Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Department of Human Services (formet gency) administers the MA program pursus 00.105.	the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). rly known as the Family Independence
	☐ The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is dministered by the Department pursuant to M	•
for Se pro	The State Disability Assistance (SDA) progor disabled persons, is established by 2004 services (formerly known as the Family Inderogram pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and all the seq., and the seq., are seq., and the seq., and the seq., are seq., and the seq., and the seq., are seq., are seq., and the seq., are seq., and the seq., are seq., are seq., and the seq., are seq.,	4 PA 344. The Department of Human pendence Agency) administers the SDA

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, the facts established at the hearing are that on January 5, 2012, Claimant submitted a Redetermination stating that his gross income was \$216 per week. Pay records from the employer indicate that Claimant's income was greater than \$216 per week. At the hearing, Claimant failed to explain the discrepancy in an adequate fashion. It is found and determined that the Department acted correctly in using the pay records they had to determine the dollar amount of Claimant's FAP benefits.						
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						
<ul> <li>         □ properly reduced Claimant's benefits         □ improperly denied Claimant's application         □ improperly closed Claimant's case         □ improperly closed Claimant's ca</li></ul>						
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 $\boxtimes$ did act properly. $\square$ did not act properly.						
Accordingly, the Department's AMP FIP FAP MA SDA CDC decision is AFFIRMED REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.						
Jan Leventer Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services						
Date Signed: March 12, 2012						
Date Mailed: March 12, 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

JL/pf

