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

IN	ITL		МΛ	TI	TER.	$\mathbf{a}$	
117		1E I	VI / 1	\			Г.

	ı

Reg. No.: 2012-71180 Issue No.: 2021; 3021

Case No.:

Hearing Date:

October 17, 2012

County: Wayne (15)

State Disability Assistance (SDA).

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Susan C. Burke

☐ Medical Assistance (MA).
☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)

## **HEARING DECISION**

This matter is before the undersigned Admini strative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 following Claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a hearing was held on October 17, 2012, in Detroit, Michigan. Partic ipants on behalf of Claimant ncluded Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included FIM., FIM, and FIM.
<u>ISSUE</u>
Due to excless assets, diid the Department properly $\square$ deny the Claimant's app lication $\boxtimes$ close Claimant's case for:
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)? ☐ Medical Assistance (MA)? ☐ State Disability Assistance (SDA)? ☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)?
FINDINGS OF FACT
The Administrative Law Judge, based on t he competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, including the test imony at the hearing, finds as material fact:
1. Cla imant ☐ applied for benefits ⊠ received benefits for:
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP). ☐ Adult Medical Program (AMP).

2.	Due to excess assets, on September 1, 2012, the Department  ☐ denied Claimant's application. ☐ closed Claimant's case.
3.	On August 3, 2012, the Department sent  Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)  notice of the denial. Closure.
4.	On August 8, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the ☐ denial of the application. ☐ closure of the case.
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
	partment policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges gibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).
	The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is ministered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, <i>et seq</i> .
Re 42 Ag thr	The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal sponsibility and W ork Opportunity Reconc iliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly k nown 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.
Se Th	The Medical Ass istance (MA) program is es tablished by the Title XIX of the Soc ial curity Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). e Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the Aprogram pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MCL 400.105.
for as	The State Disabilit y Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial ass istance disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department (formerly known the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to M CL 0.10, et seq., and 2000 AACS, Rule 400.3151 through Rule 400.3180.
pro imp Re Ag	The Food Assistanc e Program (FAP) [form erly known as the Food Stamp (FS) ogram] is establis hed by the Food St amp Act of 1977, as amend ed, 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.
Pe	r BEM 400, Countable assets cannot exceed the applicable asset limit.

2

The FAP asset limit is \$5,000.00. (BEM 400, p. 4)

The AMP asset limit is \$3,000.00. (BEM 400, p. 4)

In the present case, Claimant admitting to cashing in lottery tickets in excess of \$5,000.00 on July 11, 2012. Claimant stated that she was cashing in her niece's lottery tickets. However, the lottery winnings were issued to Claimant, so it is therefore concluded that Claimant possessed assets in excess of \$5,000.00, exceeding the asset limits for AMP and MA.

Based upon the abov e Findings of Fact and Conclus ions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that, due to excess assets, the Department
☐ properly denied Claimant's application ☐ improperly denied Claimant's application ☐ properly closed Claimant's case ☐ improperly closed Claimant's case
for: AMP FIP MA SDA FAP.
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 $\boxtimes$ AMP $\square$ FIP $\square$ MA $\square$ SDA $\boxtimes$ FAP 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:

Susan C. Burke Administrative Law Judge

for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

реранивень от пина

Date Signed: October 25, 2012

Date Mailed: October 25, 2012

**NOTICE**: Michigan Administrative Hearing S ystem (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 ti mely 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

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

## SCB/ctl

