

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2012 44897  
Issue No.: 3002  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: May 7, 2012  
County: 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 May 7, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included The Claimant and [REDACTED], who served as an interpreter. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED].

**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 March 1, 2012, the Department  denied Claimant's application  closed Claimant's case  reduced Claimant's benefits due to excess income.
3. The Claimant and her children, [REDACTED], each received increases in RSDI from \$310 to \$414 (which amounts were confirmed by the Claimant as correct) and were included by the Department when calculating FAP benefits. Exhibit 1
4. At the time of the application the Claimant indicated that she was applying for FAP benefits for a group of 3 members, and not for her daughter [REDACTED] who was not living in the group and was away at [REDACTED].
5. The Department included earned income from [REDACTED] in the FAP calculation and included Malak in the group.
6. The Department calculated FAP benefits as a group of 4 members and included [REDACTED] as a FAP group member.
7. On March 19, 2012, the Department sent  Claimant  Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the  denial.  closure.  reduction.
8. On April 9, 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, at the hearing it was determined through the Claimant's credible testimony and review of the FAP application that the Claimant's daughter [REDACTED] was not living in the FAP group and was away at college. [REDACTED]k was not eligible as a student for FAP because she was not working 20 hours per week and was not living in the FAP group, therefore the Department should not have included her in the FAP group, nor included her earned income. BEM 212 p. 8 and BEM 245, p 3. The Department correctly included unearned income for 3 group members based on unearned income from RSDI in the amount of \$414 for each member. The Department incorrectly included the earned income of the Claimant's daughter who was away at college and not living in the FAP group.

Based upon the foregoing, the Department must recalculate the Claimant's FAP benefits retroactive to the application date, March 19, 2012, and only include the unearned income confirmed at the hearing as \$414 each for Claimant and her two children and calculate the benefits based on a 3 member FAP group and issue a FAP supplement, as appropriate and in accordance with Department policy.

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:

1. The Department shall initiate recalculation of the Claimant's FAP benefits retro-active to the date of the 3/19/12 application to only include unearned income of 3 group members in accordance with this decision.
2. The Department shall issue a FAP supplement to the Claimant for any FAP benefits she was otherwise entitled to receive, if any, in accordance with Department policy.

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

Date Signed: May 14, 2012

Date Mailed: May 14, 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.

201244897/ LMF

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:

