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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2012-65314

Issue No.: 3002

Case No.:

Hearing Date: August 16, 2012 County: Wayne (17)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Susan C. Burke

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administ rative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 following Claim ant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on August 16, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claim ant and behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included

<u>ISSUE</u>

Did the Department properly c alculate Cl aimant's F ood Ass istance Program (FAP) benefits?

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based on t he competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

- Claimant received FAP benefits in the amount of \$358.00.
- 2. Claimant was in a household size of three.
- 3. On July 16, 2012, Claimant filed a hear ing reques t, protesting the amount of benefits.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Department policies are contained in the Br idges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) program] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amend ed, and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Feder al Regulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Fam ily Independence Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, Rule 400.3001 through Rule 400.3015.

Additionally, BEM 550 instructs that eighty percent of the earned income of a household be added to unearned income to determine gross income. Adjusted gross income in a household of three is determined by subtracting the standard amount of \$146.00 (RFT 255). Monthly net income for FAP pur poses is then deter mined by subtracting allowable expenses, such as a shelter deduction, if any. BEM 554.

In the present case, Claimant did not dis pute the figur es the Department used in computing Claimant's FAP benefits. Based on a careful review of the budget the Department presented at the hearing, it is found that Claimant's benefits were calculated correctly.

calculated correctly.
Based upon the abov e Findings of Fact and Co nclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department
$oxed{oxed}$ properly c alculated Claimant's FAP benefits $oxed{oxed}$ improperly calc ulated Claimant's FAP benefits.
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 not act properly. ☑ did not act properly.
Accordingly, the Department's $\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$

Susan C. Burke
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Missa

Date Signed: August 20, 2012

Date Mailed: August 20, 2012

NOTICE: Michigan Administrative Hearing Syst em (MAHS) may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a par ty within 30 days of the mailing date of this Dec ision and Order. MAHS will not or der a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's mo tion where the final decis ion 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 mailing 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

Re consideration/Rehearing Request P. O. Box 30639
Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

SGB/cl

