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

	TIL	A V .	TTC	\mathbf{n}	~ E.
IN	ΙН	MΑ	TTE	ĸ	JF:

	Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	2012-51522 2018 September 6, 2012 Wayne (82-76)
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Robert J. C	Chavez	
HEARING DI	<u>ECISION</u>	
This matter is before the undersigned Administration and MCL 400.37 following Claimant's require telephone hearing was held on September 6, 2 on behalf of Claimant included Department of Human Services (Department)	est for a hearing. 2012, from Detroit, M Participant	After due notice, a
<u>ISSUI</u>	<u>E</u>	
Did the Department properly deny Claima for:	nt's application 🛭 c	lose Claimant's case
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)? ☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)? ☐ Medical Assistance (MA)?		esistance (AMP)? Assistance (SDA)? ent and Care (CDC)?
FINDINGS O	OF FACT	
The Administrative Law Judge, based on the evidence on the whole record, finds as material		rial, and substantial
Claimant ☐ applied for benefits ☒ receive	d 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 due to Claimant failing to meet MA eligibility requirements.
3.	On April 19, 2012, the Department sent Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the denial. Closure.
4.	On May 7, 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 imp 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 olemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal gulations (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	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. Claimant was not aged, blind, or disabled. As such, Claimant no longer met eligibility for the MA program, per BEM 105.
Claimant agreed that eligibility requirements were no longer met. 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.
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
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 did act properly.
Accordingly, the Department's AMP FIP FAP MA SDA CDC decision is AFFIRMED REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.
Robert J. Chavez Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director
Date Signed: September 14, 2012

Date Mailed: September 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 <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

