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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2012-52367 Issue No.: 2018 Case No.: Hearing Date: Oakland (63-03) County:

September 10, 2012

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Robert J. Chavez

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 September 10, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included AHR and Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included

ISSUE

Did the Department properly \Box deny Claimant's application \boxtimes close Claimant's case for:

ĺ		ĺ
Ì	\sim	

Family Independence Program (FIP)?

Food Assistance Program (FAP)?

Medical Assistance (MA)?

Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)? State Disability Assistance (SDA)?

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 received benefits for:



Family Independence Program (FIP).

Food Assistance Program (FAP).

Medical Assistance (MA).

Adult Medical Assistance (AMP).

State Disability Assistance (SDA).

Child Development and Care (CDC).

- On June 1, 2012, the Department
 denied Claimant's application
 due to Claimant failing to meet MA eligibility requirements.
- On May 2, 2012, the Department sent
 ☐ Claimant ☐ Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the ☐ denial. ☐ closure.
- 4. On May 2, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the ☐ denial of the application. ⊠ closure of the case.

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 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 of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105.

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 State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 2000 AACS, 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, 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 disagreed that eligibility requirements were no longer met, and alleged disability. Furthemore, the Department testified that an ex parte review was not conducted, as required per policy guidelines found at BEM 105, p. 4 (2010). Therefore, as Claimant contests that the eligibility guidelines for MA are still met, and the Department failed to conduct an ex parte review in violation of policy, the Department's actions were incorrect and Claimant's MA was improperly 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 properly closed Claimant's case

improperly denied Claimant's application 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 i did act properly. i 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 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. Reopen Claimant's MA case retroactive to the date of negative action.

2. Initiate an ex parte review of Claimant's MA case, including a review as to whether or not Claimant has a disability that must be further explored by MRT.

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

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 <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

RJC/pf

