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:

20124056 3019

November 14, 2011 Wayne County DHS (17)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Lynn M. Ferris

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 November 14, 2011, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included ES.

also appeared as an interpreter for the Claimant.

ISSUE

Due to excess assets, did the Department properly deny the Claimant's application Close Claimant's case for:

\times	

Family Independence Program (FIP)?

Food Assistance Program (FAP)?

Medical Assistance (MA)?

Medical Assistance (AMP)?
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, including the testimony at the hearing, finds as material fact:

1. Claimant applied for benefits 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).

- Due to excess assets, on October 1, 2011, the Department
 ☐ denied Claimant's application.
 ☑ closed Claimant's case.
- On September 20, 2011, the Department sent
 Claimant
 Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)
 notice of the
 denial.
 Closure.
- 4. On September 26, 2011, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the ☐ denial of the application. ⊠ closure of the case.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

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

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

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 2000 AACS, Rule 400.3151 through Rule 400.3180.

Additionally, the Department used asset information supplied by the Claimant in March 2011 (when his case was opened) and as part of the mass update due to the change in policy effective October 1, 2011, determined that the Claimant's assets had not changed and closed the Claimant's case due to excess assets. The Department closed the

Claimant's case due to its determination that the Claimant's assets exceeded the \$5,000 FAP asset limitation. BEM 400. In March 2011 the Department had no asset limit for FAP benefits. The Department relied on old stale information and closed the Claimant's case. The information the Department relied upon was not the best available information, and the Claimant's current assets should have been updated and verified before the closure of the Claimant's FAP case. The Department relied upon a reconstructed asset inquiry and used the March 2011 account balance as a basis for the closure. Clearly this information does not accurately reflect FAP assets in October 2011.

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 assets, the Department

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

for: \square AMP \square FIP \boxtimes 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 i did act properly. i did not act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's \square AMP \square FIP \boxtimes FAP \square 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:

- 1. The Department is ordered to initiate reinstatement of the Claimant's FAP case retroactive to the date of closure, October 1, 2011.
- 2. The Department may seek further verification of assets to determine the Claimant's FAP eligibility.
- 3. The Claimant shall have 10 days to respond to any verification of assets sought by the Department.
- 4. The Department shall issue a supplement to the Claimant for any FAP benefits he is otherwise eligible to receive in accordance with Department policy retroactive to the date of closure.

Lynn F. Ferris Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: <u>11/16/11</u>

Date Mailed: <u>11/16/11</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.

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

LMF/hw

CC:			