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

IN	TH	MΛ.	TT		\mathbf{a}	
IIV		VI /~		ᄗ		Г.

	Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	2012-72374 2012 December 3, 2012 Wayne (82-76)				
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Robert J. Chav	ez					
HEARING DECIS	SION					
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 December 3, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included						
ISSUE						
Due to excess assets, did the Department proper ☐ close Claimant's case for:	ly ⊠ deny the C	laimant's application				
Family Independence Program (FIP)? Medical Assistance (MA)? Food Assistance Program (FAP)?	=	Assistance (AMP)? Assistance (SDA)?				
FINDINGS OF FA	<u>ACT</u>					
The Administrative Law Judge, based on the of evidence on the whole record, including the testing fact:	•	•				
 Claimant	enefits for:					
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP). ☐ Medical Assistance (MA). ☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)		Assistance (AMP). Assistance (SDA).				

2.	Due to excess assets, on August 14, 2012, the Department ☐ denied Claimant's application. ☐ closed Claimant's case.
3.	On August 14, 2012, the Department sent Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the denial. Closure.
4.	On August 20, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the \boxtimes denial of the application. \square 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 Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly known 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 Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social 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 program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MCL 400.105.
for as	The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department (formerly known the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 0.10, et seq., and 2000 AACS, Rule 400.3151 through Rule 400.3180.
an \$3	ditionally, Claimant admitted that his assets at the time of application were \$15,461 d did not dispute the Department's findings in the case. As the MA asset limit is ,000 for a group the size of Claimant's, and Claimant's assets exceeded this limit, the partment properly denied Claimant's MA application.
sta	sed upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons ited on the record, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that, due to excess sets, 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 \infty \text{did act properly.} \text{did not act properly.}
Accordingly, the Department's \square AMP \square FIP \boxtimes MA \square SDA \square (FAP)decision is \boxtimes AFFIRMED \square REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.

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

Date Signed: January 4, 2013

Date Mailed: January 4, 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. (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 **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.

2012-72374/RJC

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

