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

## IN THE MATTER OF:

	Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	20128368 3021 November 30, 2011 Wayne DHS (18)		
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Christian Gardocki				
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 selephone hearing was held on November 30, 2011, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the above named claimant. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included Specialist.				
<u>ISSUE</u>				
Due to excess assets, did the Department properly $\square$ deny the Claimant's application $\square$ close Claimant's case for:				
Family Independence Program (FIP)?  Medical Assistance (MA)?	=	Assistance (AMP)? ce Program (FAP)?		
FINDINGS OF FACT				
The Administrative Law Judge, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, including the testimony at the hearing, finds as material fact:				
Claimant ☐ applied for benefits ☒ received benefits for:				
Family Independence Program (FIP).  Medical Assistance (MA).		Assistance (AMP). ce Program (FAP).		
2. Due to excess assets, on 9/20/11, the Department ☐ denied Claimant's application. ☐ closed Claimant's case.				

3. On 9/20/11, the Department sent ☐ Claimant ☐ Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the ☐ denial. ☐ closure.			
<ul> <li>4. On 10/25/11, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the ☐ denial of the application. ☐ closure of the case.</li> </ul>			
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW			
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 Federa Regulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, <i>et seq.</i> , and 1999 AC, Rule 400.3001 through Rule 400.3015. Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).			
Effective 10/1/2011, DHS imposed a \$5,000 asset limit for FAP households. BEM 400 at 4. Savings and checking account balances are factored into the asset limit determination.			
In the present case, DHS had a record that Claimant had a total of \$5726.78 in assets based on checking and savings account information. DHS was not able to establish from when Claimant had the assets or provide any documentation that the assets existed. On 9/20/11, DHS initiated termination of Claimant's FAP benefits due to the allegedly excess assets.			
The DHS failure to establish that Claimant's assets exceeded \$5,000 as of 9/2011 is problematic. Perhaps Claimant's assets exceeded \$5,000 in some month prior to 9/2011 (perhaps not). Even accepting that Claimant's assets exceeded \$5,000 during a time prior to 9/2011 would not justify a conclusion that Claimant's assets continued to exceed \$5,000 as of 9/2011. The failure by DHS to have any evidence of Claimant's assets for 9/2011 is a basis to justify reversal of the termination of FAP benefits.			
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 assets, the Department			
<ul> <li>□ properly denied Claimant's application</li> <li>□ properly closed Claimant's case</li> <li>□ improperly denied Claimant's application</li> <li>□ improperly closed Claimant's case</li> </ul>			
for: AMP FIP MA FAP.  DECISION AND ORDER			

dge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conc s stated on the record, finds that the Department did not act properly.	lusions
ent's  AMP FIP MA  FAP decision is SED for the reasons stated on the record.	
ORDERED TO DO THE FOLLOWING WITHIN 10 DA	YS OF

- 1. reinstate Claimant's FAP benefits effective 10/2011; and
- 2. supplement Claimant for any benefits not received as a result of the improper termination

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

Date Signed: <u>12/7/11</u>

Date Mailed: 12/7/11

**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 **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 Reconsideration/Rehearing Request

## 2012-8368/CG

P. O. Box 30639 Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

## CG/hw

