

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**



Reg. No.: 2012 67247  
Issue No.: 3015  
Case No.:   
Hearing Date: August 29, 2012  
County: Oakland County DHS (02)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Lynn M. Ferris

**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, telephone hearing was held on August 29, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant and the Claimant's Witness, . Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included , ES.

**ISSUE**

Due to excess income, did the Department properly  deny the Claimant's application  close Claimant's case  reduce Claimant's benefits for:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP)?        | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)?    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA)? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA)?                  | <input type="checkbox"/> 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 for:  received benefits for:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP). | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP).    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP).                | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA). |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA).                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC).  |

2. On July 30, 2012, the Department  denied Claimant's application  
 closed Claimant's case  reduced Claimant's benefits  
due to excess income.
3. On 7/13/12, the Department sent  
 Claimant  Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)  
notice of the  denial.  closure.  reduction.
4. On 7/23/12, Claimant or Claimant's AHR filed a hearing request, protesting the  
 denial of the application.  closure of the case.  reduction of benefits.

### **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 Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is administered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*

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

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department (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, in this case, the Department, based upon a review of the Claimant's FAP case determined that the Claimant's mother, who was living with her at the time of the application, and during the review, was working and had income. The Department closed the FAP case on 8/1/12 due to excess income being received by the household. The Notice of Case Action indicated that the closure was due to refusal to verify information. (Exhibit 3). A review of the Claimant's mother's income indicates that based upon income received in May through June 2012, the income received exceeded the income limit for a group of 3 persons. The income limit for 3 person FAP group is \$2008, and the Claimant's group income in June 2012 was \$3996 which exceeded the gross income limit. (Exhibits 6 and 2). A review of the income and the FAP budget was made during the hearing, and the income amounts received weekly by the Claimant's mother were confirmed. Department of Human Services Reference Tables, (RFT) 250,(2011) FAP Income Limits.

The Claimant credibly testified that she advised her worker (who also assisted the Claimant in completing the application) at the time of the application that her mother was in the FAP group, but that meals were prepared separately and that she was only applying for herself and her child. She also advised the worker that her mother was employed and working. At the time of the application the Claimant was 20 years of age. BEM 212 addresses requirements regarding FAP group members and requires that parents and children under 22 years of age who live together must be in the same group regardless of whether the child(ren) have their own spouse or child who lives with the group. Thus, the Department correctly included the Claimant's mother's income when computing the Claimant's FAP benefits and determining eligibility at the time it closed the case due to excess income. Although the Department correctly determined the FAP group was not eligible due to excess income, the notice sent to the Claimant stated due to failure to verify. Because the Department correctly determined the Claimant was no longer qualified due to excess income, the sending of the notice stating the wrong reason was a Bridges system error and does not change the outcome of the case. Therefore, the Department's closure of the FAP case is determined to be correct. Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 212(2011), pp.1.

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, due to excess income, the Department  properly  improperly

- denied Claimant's application
- reduced Claimant's benefits
- closed Claimant's case

for:  AMP  FIP  FAP  MA  SDA  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  did act properly  did not act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's  AMP  FIP  FAP  MA  SDA  CDC decision is  AFFIRMED  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:



**Lynn M. Ferris**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: September 5, 2012

Date Mailed: September 5, 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 **MAY** 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.

201267247/LMF

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

LMF/hw

cc:

