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

IN THE MATTER OF:		Reg. No. Issue No.:	201250985 2003	
		Case No:	June 20, 2012	
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Kevin Scully				
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 Wednesday, June 20, 2012, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included  Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included				
ISSUE				
Did the Department properly $oxtimes$ deny Claimant's application $oxtimes$ close Claimant's case for:				
Food Assistance Program (FAP)?		☐ Adult Medical Assist ☐ State Disability Assi ☐ Child Development	stance (SDÁ)?	
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 Independence Program (FIP),  Food Assistance Program (SDA),  Medical Assistance (CDC).	Adult Medical As	ssistance (AMP), ability Assistance	
2.	On April 24, 2012, the Depart closed Claimant's case due financial requirements for Medica	to the Claimant's failu		

3.	On April 24, 2012, the Department sent $\boxtimes$ Claimant $\boxtimes$ Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the $\boxtimes$ denial. $\square$ closure.		
4.	On May 1, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the $\boxtimes$ denial of the application. $\square$ closure of the case.		
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW			
•	policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the bility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).		
Responsibility 42 USC 601 Agency) adr through Rule	ily Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal ty and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, I, et seq. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence ministers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, R 400.3101 e 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program tober 1, 1996.		
program] is implemented Regulations	od Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence ninisters FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, R 400.3001 et 400.3015.		
Security Act The Departi	lical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). ment of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence ministers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MCL		
	ult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq.		
for disabled Services (fo	e Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human rmerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA suant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 2000 AACS, R 400.3151 through Rule		
and XX of t 1990, and th The program and 99. Th	d Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE the Social Security Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. In is implemented by Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 98 the Department provides services to adults and children pursuant to MCL and 1999 AC, R 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.		

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 $\square$ properly denied Claimant's application, $\boxtimes$ improperly denied Claimant's application, $\square$ properly closed Claimant's case, $\square$ improperly closed Claimant's case for: $\square$ AMP $\square$ FIP $\square$ FAP $\boxtimes$ 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 $\square$ did act properly. $\boxtimes$ did not act properly.			
Accordingly, the Department's $\square$ AMP $\square$ FIP $\square$ FAP $\boxtimes$ MA $\square$ SDA $\square$ CDC decision is $\square$ AFFIRMED $\boxtimes$ <b>REVERSED</b> for the reasons stated on the record.			
$\hfill \square$ The department is ordered to do the following within 10 days of the date of mailing of this decision and order:			
1.	Initiate a determination of the Claimant's eligibility for Medical Assistance (MA) as of December 1, 2011.		
2.	Provide the Claimant with written notification of the Department's revised eligibility determination.		
3.	Issue the Claimant any retroactive benefits she may be eligible to receive, if any.		
	/s/ Kevin Scully Administrative Law Judge For Maura Corrigan, Director		
Date Signed:	June 21, 2012 Department of Human Services		
Date Mailed:	June 21, 2012		
NOTICE: M	ichigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS) may order a rehearing or		

**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 <u>MAY</u> 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

## KS/tb

