

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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2012-32633
Issue No.: 2018
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: June 13, 2012
County: Wayne (15)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Alice C. Elkin

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 June 13, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED], Eligibility Specialist.

ISSUE

Did the Department properly deny Claimant's application close Claimant's case for:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA)? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC)? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Direct Support Services (DSS)? | |

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 received benefits for:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP). | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP). |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP). | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA). |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA). | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC). |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Direct Support Services (DSS). | |

2. On January 1, 2012, the Department
 denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's case
due to lack of a disability.
3. On January 30, 2012, the Department sent
 Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)
notice of the denial. closure.
4. On February 7, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the
 denial of the application. closure of the case.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Department policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

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, *et seq.* The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 1999 AC, R 400.3101 through Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996.

The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) program] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 1999 AC, R 400.3001 through Rule 400.3015.

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105.

The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is administered 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, *et seq.*, and 2000 ACS, 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.

Direct Support Services (DSS) is administered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.57a, et. seq., and Mich Admin Code R 400.3603.

Additionally, Claimant received MA coverage under the Ad-Care program. In connection with Claimant's December 2011 MA redetermination, the Department concluded that Claimant was not eligible for MA coverage under the Ad-Care program and sent her a Notice of Case Action dated January 30, 2012, notifying her that her Ad-Care coverage closed effective January 1, 2012, and she was not eligible for MA coverage because she was not aged, blind, disabled, under 21 years of age, pregnant or the parent or caretaker of minor children.

In order to be eligible for Ad-Care coverage, the individual must be aged (over age 65) or disabled. BEM 163; BEM 240. At the hearing, Claimant testified that she was not over age 65 and was not disabled. Therefore the Department acted in accordance with Department policy when it closed Claimant's Ad-Care case.

Before closing a client's MA case, however, the Department is required to conduct an expedite review to consider the Claimant's eligibility for MA coverage under all other MA categories. BEM 105. To receive MA, a client must be aged (65 or older), blind, disabled, entitled to Medicare or formerly blind or disabled, or have dependent children, be a caretaker relative of dependent children, or be under age 21 and pregnant or recently pregnant. BEM 105. In this case, Claimant verified that she was [REDACTED] years old, not disabled, and not the caretaker of a minor child. Thus, Claimant was not eligible for MA coverage.

However, the facts in this case established that Claimant had been receiving Adult Medical Program (AMP) coverage from the date she applied for MA coverage on November 16, 2010, to February 1, 2011, at which time the Department converted her coverage to Ad-Care coverage. According to the Department, this change in coverage resulted from the Department's action, with no action by, or request from, Claimant. BEM 105 provides that persons who qualify under more than one MA category are entitled to coverage under the most beneficial category, that being the one that results in eligibility or the least amount of excess income. It follows that, when the Department concluded that Claimant was not eligible for Ad-Care coverage or other MA coverage, she was entitled to have her AMP coverage, which she had been receiving prior to the change in her coverage to Ad-Care, reinstated. By failing to do so, the Department did not act in accordance with Department policy. Although the Department testified that Claimant's income exceeded the AMP income limit, there was no evidence presented that the Department had prepared an AMP budget for Claimant or notified Claimant in

writing that she was not eligible for AMP coverage at the time it closed her Ad-Care case.

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

for: AMP FIP FAP MA SDA CDC DSS.

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. did not act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's AMP FIP FAP MA SDA CDC DSS decision is AFFIRMED 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:

1. Reinstate Claimant's AMP coverage as of January 1, 2012; and
2. Provide AMP coverage to Claimant that she is otherwise eligible to receive from January 1, 2012, ongoing.



Alice C. Elkin
Administrative Law Judge
For Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: June 21, 2012

Date Mailed: June 21, 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 **MAY** 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

ACE/cl

cc:

