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

IN THE MATTER OF:



 Reg. No.:
 2012-71546

 Issue No.:
 2018

 Case No.:
 January 2, 2013

 Hearing Date:
 January 2, 2013

 County:
 Wayne (82-55)

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 January 2, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included for the Department of Human Services (Department) includ

ISSUE

Due to a failure to meet eligibility requirements, did the Department properly deny Claimant's application 🛛 close Claimant's case 🗌 reduce Claimant's benefits for:

L			
ľ			

Family Independence Program (FIP)? Food Assistance Program (FAP)?

IP)? State Disability Assistance (SDA)?

Medical Assistance (MA)?

Child Development and Care (CDC)?

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, including testimony of witnesses, finds as material fact:

- 1. Claimant applied for was receiving: FIP FAP MA SDA CDC.
- 2. Claimant did not allege a dependent child or a disability during the initial redetermination; however, on August 13, 2012, evidence of disability was submitted to the Department.

2012-71546/RJC

- 3. On September 1, 2012, the Department
 - denied Claimant's application.
 - \boxtimes closed Claimant's case.
 - reduced Claimant's benefits .
- 4. On August 1, 2012, the Department sent notice of the
 - denial of Claimant's application.

 \boxtimes closure of Claimant's case.

reduction of Claimant's benefits.

5. On August 13, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the

denial of Claimant's application.

 \boxtimes closure of Claimant's case.

reduction of Claimant's benefits.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Department policies are found 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 1997 AACS R 400.3101-3131. 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 1997 AACS R 400.3001-3015

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 1998-2000 AACS R 400.3151-400.3180.

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 1997 AACS R 400.5001-5015.

Additionally, the Department testified that Claimant was considered for all MA programs, including the AMP program. Claimant did not meet the eligibility requirements for any program, as Claimant did not allege disability and was not the caretaker of a dependent child. The AMP program is currently closed to enrollment. Therefore, as Claimant did not meet eligibility requirements, the Administrative Law Judge holds that the Department was initially correct to close Claimant's case.

However, on August 13, 2012, Claimant submitted a letter from a treating source physician that alleges disability. The Department testified at hearing that, had Claimant submitted evidence of disability between the notice of case action and the actual closure of the case, Claimant's MA case would be reinstated and evaluated for disability by the Medical Review Team.

Policy supports the Department's position. Negative actions must be deleted from Bridges in some situations. Enter the information the client provided to meet the requirement that caused the negative action, using the appropriate Bridges screens. BAM 220, p. 10.

As Claimant, therefore, provided information before the case closure date showing a potentially met requirement that caused the negative action, the negative action in question should have been deleted, pending a review for disability by the appropriate authorities. Therefore, the undersigned holds that Claimant's case was closed improperly.

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 improperly

 \boxtimes closed Claimant's case.

denied Claimant's application.

reduced Claimant's 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 \Box did act properly \Box did not act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's decision is \Box 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. Reinstate Claimant's MA benefits retroactive to the date of negative action.

2. Initiate a review of Claimant's MA case for disability, as per the policies for the determination of disability with regard to an MA case.

Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: February 5, 2013

Date Mailed: February 5, 2013

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.

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

