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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 201235252 Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:

2014, 3003 April 17, 2012

Kalamazoo County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Corey A. Arendt

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 April 17, 2012 from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included . Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included

ISSUE

Due to excess income, did the Department properly deny the Claimant's application ☐ close Claimant's case ⊠ 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 \square applied for benefits for: \square 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 March 1, 2012, the Department denied Claimant's application
 Closed Claimant's case reduced Claimant's benefits due to excess income.
- On February 6, 2012, the Department sent
 □ Claimant □ Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) □ denial. □ closure. □ reduction.
- 4. On February 17, 2012, Claimant or Claimant's AHR filed a hearing request, protesting the indenial of the application. In closure of the case. In 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).

The 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 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 (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105.

After an extensive review of Claimant's budget I have determined all calculations were properly made at review, and all FAP issuance/budgeting rules were properly applied. As such, the Department's reduction of Claimant's FAP benefits must be upheld.

Furthermore, the Department failed to present any testimony or exhibits regarding the MA budget determinations. Consequently, I was unable to review the calculations and unable to determine whether the Department properly applied the applicable laws and policies. Therefore, I am reversing the Department in regards to the MA determination.

Based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, I affirm the Department in part and reverse the Department in part.

DECISION AND ORDER

I find, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, find that the Department properly determined the Claimant's FAP eligibility but improperly determined the Claimants MA eligibility.

Accordingly, the Department's actions are **AFFIRMED** in part and **REVERSED** in part.

THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO DO THE FOLLOWING WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER:

1. Initiate a redetermination as to the Claimant's eligibility for MA benefits beginning March 1, 2012 and issue retroactive benefits if otherwise eligible and qualified.

<u>/s/_____</u>

Corey A. Arendt Administrative Law Judge For Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: <u>April 19, 2012</u> Date Mailed: <u>April 20, 2012</u>

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

CAA/cr

