

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 201214838  
Issue No.: 3019  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: January 5, 2012  
County: Wayne County DHS (17)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Andrea J. Bradley

**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 5, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant, [REDACTED], and her authorized hearing representative (AHR), [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED], Eligibility Specialist, [REDACTED], Eligibility Specialist, and [REDACTED], DHS translator.

**ISSUE**

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

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

1. Claimant  applied for benefits  received benefits for:

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

2. Due to excess assets, on October 31, 2011, the Department  
 denied Claimant's application.  closed Claimant's case.
3. On October 18, 2011, the Department sent  
 Claimant  Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)  
notice of the  denial.  closure.
4. On November 22, 2011, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the  
 denial of the application.  closure of the case.

### **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 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.

Additionally, effective October 1, 2011, the Department policy states that the asset limit for FAP program benefits is \$5,000. BEM 400. In this case, the Department testified that it sought verification that the Claimant's vehicles were under the asset limit. The

Department testified that it sent the Claimant a verification checklist seeking vehicle information on September 18, 2011, with the proofs being due back on September 27, 2011. The Claimant's husband timely submitted a letter stating that they do not own any vehicles. During the hearing, credible documentary evidence was presented by the Department, which showed that the Claimant's group has multiple vehicles registered in their names at the address where the Claimant resides. Based on this information, the Department acted in accordance with policy when it determined that the Claimant has assets that she refused to verify and that multiple vehicles exceed the asset limit.

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


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  AMP  FIP  MA  SDA  FAP decision is  
 AFFIRMED  REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Andrea J. Bradley  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: January 13, 2012

Date Mailed: January 13, 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.

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.

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

AJB/hw

cc:

