


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



IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2012 44203
Issue No.: 3002
Case No.: 
Hearing Date: June 7, 2012
County: Wayne County DHS (55)

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 June 7, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant. An interpreter from the Language Link, Rajid Bhuiyan, appeared as the interpreter on behalf of the Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included , Assistance Payments Supervisor and , ES.

ISSUE

Due to excess income, did the Department properly deny the Claimant's application close Claimant's case reduce Claimant's benefits for:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA)? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA)? | <input type="checkbox"/> 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 applied for benefits for: received benefits for:

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

2. On April 1, 2012, the Department denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's case reduced Claimant's benefits due to excess income.
3. On March 23, 2012, the Department sent Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the denial. closure. reduction.
4. On March 28, 2012, Claimant or Claimant's AHR filed a hearing request, protesting the denial of the application. closure of the case. 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 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 AACCS, Rule 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, Rule 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.

Additionally, as a result of a redetermination, the Claimant's food assistance was reduced because the Claimant reported that he began receiving RSDI in the amount of \$858 per month. The Claimant's prior income used to calculate his FAP benefits was \$500. This amount was based on a letter received by the Department signed by a friend of the Claimant indicating that he helped the Claimant every month in the amount of \$500. Exhibit 6. The Department, based upon the information provided by Claimant, used \$500 as the Claimant's income for purposes of calculating his FAP benefits.

At the hearing a thorough review of the current FAP budget based on \$858 in income, a group of 3 members and the \$0 rent amount was confirmed by the Department and the Claimant. The Budget presented was correct and the FAP benefit amount of \$371 is also correct. The Claimant's FAP benefit amount went down because his income increased by \$358 dollars, due to the receipt of RSDI. Exhibits 4 and 5. The Department's calculation in that regard is correct.

The Claimant noted at the hearing that he is currently receiving only \$748 in RSDI benefits. The Department confirmed that as of June 1, 2012, SSA began deducting \$100 from Claimant's RSDI, and therefore acknowledged that it would recompute the Claimant's FAP benefits to include the medical premium of \$100 as a medical expense. This will change the Claimant's FAP benefit amount slightly.

Lastly, the Claimant testified that the \$500 he previously received from his friend was in fact a loan and he is currently repaying the loan to his friend. BEM 503 provides:

Bona fide loan means all the following are present:

A loan contract or the lender's written statement clearly indicating the borrower's indebtedness.

An acknowledgment from the borrower of the loan obligation.

The borrower's expressed intent to repay the loan by pledging real or individual property or anticipated income. BEM 503, page 18.

The evidence of record at the time the Claimant advised the Department about the \$500 indicates that the Claimant's friend was helping him and did not indicate that the \$500 was a loan. The letter was provided to the Department with the Claimant's shelter verification. Based on this evidence and the requirements of BEM 503, the Department correctly included the \$500 as unearned income and not as a loan as it was unaware that a loan existed. Had the Claimant provided a statement from his lender that, in fact, the money was a loan and was required to be repaid, the situation would have been different and the \$500 would not have been included. Therefore, the Department properly included as income the \$500 the Claimant received as unearned income when computing his original 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, due to excess income, the Department properly improperly

- denied Claimant's application
- reduced Claimant's benefits
- closed Claimant's case


for: AMP FIP FAP MA SDA 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 did act properly 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.

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


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

Date Signed: June 11, 2012

Date Mailed: June 11, 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 to:

Michigan Administrative Hearings
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request
P. O. Box 30639
Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

LMF/hw

cc:

