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

INI	ти	_ ^ ^	TTE	R OF:
114				K UF

	Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	2012-45097 2018 September 20, 2012 Wayne (82-41)		
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Robert J. Cl	navez			
HEARING DE	CISION			
This matter is before the undersigned Administrated MCL 400.37 following Claimant's requestelephone hearing was held on September Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Department of Human Services (Department)	st for a hearing. er 20, 2012, from . Part	After due notice, a		
ISSUE				
Did the Department properly deny Claiman for:	it's application 🛚 cl	ose Claimant's case		
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)? ☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)? ☐ Medical Assistance (MA)?		sistance (AMP)? ssistance (SDA)? ent 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:				
Claimant □ applied for benefits □ received	I benefits for:			
 ☐ Family Independence Program (FIP). ☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP). ☐ Medical Assistance (MA). 	State Disability	ssistance (AMP). Assistance (SDA). ent and Care (CDC).		

2.	On May 1, 2012, the Department ☐ denied Claimant's application ☐ closed Claimant's case due to Claimant failing to meet MA eligibility requirements.
3.	On March 29, 2012, the Department sent Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the denial. Closure.
4.	On April 9, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the ☐ denial of the application. ☐ closure of the case.
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
	partment policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the dges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).
Re 42 Ag thr	The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal sponsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence ency) 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 im 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 ogulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence ency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, Rule 0.3001 through Rule 400.3015.
Se Th Ag	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 of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence ency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MCL 0.105.
	The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is ministered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq.
for Se pro	The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human rvices (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA ogram pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 2000 AACS, Rule 400.3151 through le 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, a redetermination was conducted regarding Claimant's MA case. The Department conducted a review and determined that Claimant was no longer under 21, and was not pregnant, or a caretaker of a minor child. Clamant was not aged, blind, or disabled. As such, Claimant no longer met eligibility for the MA program, per BEM 105.				
Claimant did not state exactly how she still met eligiblity requirements, nor did Claimant inform the Department of a change in her status that would have affected the Department's decision. Furthemore, the Department credibly testified that an ex parte review was conducted, per policy guidelines found at BEM 105, p. 4 (2010). Therefore, as Claimant no longer meets eligibility requirements, and an ex parte review was conducted, the Department's actions were correct and Claimant's MA was properly closed. If Claimant feels that she has had a change in status that would make her eligible for the MA program, Claimant may reapply for benefits.				
Finally, the Department properly determined that Claimant may meet disability standards for the MA-P and SDA programs, and a determination into eligibility for those programs with the MRT is still pending.				
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 the Department				
 □ properly denied Claimant's application □ improperly denied Claimant's application □ improperly closed Claimant's case □ improperly closed Claimant's case 				
for:				
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 ightharpoonup did not act properly.				

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

Robert J. Chavez
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: October 16, 2012

Date Mailed: October 16, 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: