## 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:	2012-35490 1018 June 20, 2012 Oakland (63-02)
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Robert J. Cha	ivez	, ,
HEARING DEC	ISION	
This matter is before the undersigned Administration and MCL 400.37 following Claimant's request telephone hearing was held on June 20, 2012, for behalf of Claimant included . Proof Human Services (Department) included	for a hearing. rom Detroit, Michig	After due notice, a
ISSUE		
Due to excess income, did the Department prop ☐ close Claimant's case ☐ reduce Claimant's b		laimant's application
<ul><li>☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)?</li><li>☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)?</li><li>☐ Medical Assistance (MA)?</li></ul>	•	sistance (AMP)? ssistance (SDA)? nt and Care (CDC)?
FINDINGS OF	<u>FACT</u>	
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: ☐ r	eceived benefits fo	r:
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP). ☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP). ☐ Medical Assistance (MA)	= '	esistance (AMP). Assistance (SDA).

2.	On November 30, 2011, the Department 🖂 denied Claimant's application ☐ closed Claimant's case ☐ reduced Claimant's benefits due to excess income.
3.	On November 30, 2011, the Department sent  Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)  notice of the denial. closure. reduction.
4.	On February 15, 2012, Claimant or Claimant's AHR filed a hearing request, protesting the $\boxtimes$ denial of the application. $\square$ closure of the case. $\square$ reduction of benefits.
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
	epartment 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 esponsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence lency) 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 plemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal egulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence lency) 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

did act properly

400.14(1) and 1999 AC, Rule 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015. Additionally, Claimant disputed the income findings of the Department. Specifically, Claimant disputed income at stating that he had lost that job and the income should not have been included. The Administrative Law Judge finds that the evidence in the file shows that Claimant was not working at during the time of the application, and no income from this job should have been included. However, Claimant also stated income on his application from , alleging a pay rate of \$7.40 an hour and 40 hours per week. Claimant had submitted a letter to the Department that confirms Claimant's statement of wages. While Claimant alleged that he had not begun work at until November 14, the Department was prospecting income in this matter, not making a determination of actual income; that is, the Department was making a determination as to Claimant's average monthly wage, and not making a determination as to how much Claimant made during the month of Combined with Claimant's income as a home health aide provider, Claimant's employment income is still far above the income limits for the FIP program. Therefore, as Claimant's employment income exceeds the income limits for the FIP program, the Department was correct to deny Claimant's application for FIP 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, due to excess properly income, the Department improperly Microsoft denied Claimant's application reduced Claimant's benefits closed Claimant's case for:  $\square$  AMP  $\square$  FIP  $\square$  FAP  $\square$  MA  $\square$  SDA  $\square$  CDC. **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

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

did not act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's  $\square$  AMP  $\boxtimes$  FIP  $\square$  FAP  $\square$  MA  $\square$  SDA  $\square$  CDC decision is  $\boxtimes$  AFFIRMED  $\square$  REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.

Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: July 23, 2012

Date Mailed: July 23, 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

## RJC/pf

cc: