

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 201219245  
Issue No.: 3015  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: January 17, 2012  
County: Wayne (19)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Alice C. Elkin

**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 17, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED], Family Independence Manager, and [REDACTED] Eligibility Specialist.

**ISSUE**

Did the Department properly  deny Claimant's application  close Claimant's case for:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP)?        | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)?    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA)? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA)?                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC)?  |

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP). | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA). |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA).                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC).  |

2. On January 1, 2012, the Department  
 denied Claimant's application       closed Claimant's case  
due to excess income.
3. On December 1, 2012, the Department sent  
 Claimant       Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)  
notice of the       denial.       closure.
4. On December 9, 2011, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the  
 denial of the application.       closure of the case.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

Department policies are contained 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 1999 AC, R 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, R 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 of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105.

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 State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 2000 ACS, R 400.3151 through Rule 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 1999 AC, R 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.

Additionally, at the hearing, the Department clarified that, although Claimant had delayed providing certain verifications, the Department had accepted his subsequently provided verifications as timely and closed his FAP case because of excess income.

The Department used Claimant's October 2011 income to conclude that Claimant had gross income in excess of the gross income limit for simplified income reporting FAP groups. Claimant conceded that the gross income amounts used by the Department in calculating his earned income were accurate. Based on his weekly October 2011 paystubs, the Department properly calculated Claimant's gross monthly earned income as \$3779. BEM 501; BEM 505. However, a further review of the FAP budget after the hearing showed that the Department also included unearned income in calculating Claimant's gross monthly income even though it did not present any evidence at the hearing supporting this unearned income. Furthermore, although the Department testified that Claimant had income exceeding the gross income limit as established by his October paystubs, Claimant's FAP case continued to remain open until January 1, 2012, with no FAP benefits issued to Claimant in November 2011 or December 2011. At the hearing, Claimant credibly testified that he had reported to the Department that he was going to be laid off for a one-week period in November 2011 and for the period from December 16, 2011, to January 9, 2012, a change that may have resulted in an increase in his FAP benefits. See BEM 505. Although the Department testified that Claimant had failed to provide written verification of his lay-offs, there was no evidence presented by the Department at the hearing that the Department had ever provided Claimant a written request for verification of the lay-offs as required under Department policy. BAM 130; BEM 505. Further, the Department introduced evidence at the hearing that it was aware of Claimant's unemployment benefit income for November 2011, based on a data exchange with the Michigan Unemployment Insurance Agency. Consequently, the Department did not properly consider whether the changes reported by Claimant affected his FAP budget for November 1, 2011, ongoing. BEM 505.

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 denied Claimant's application       improperly denied Claimant's application  
 properly closed Claimant's case               improperly closed Claimant's case

for:  AMP  FIP  FAP  MA  SDA  CDC.

**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  FAP  MA  SDA  CDC 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:

1. Remove the negative case action closing Claimant's FAP case effective January 1, 2012;
2. Begin recalculating Claimant's FAP budget for November 1, 2011, ongoing, in accordance with Department policy;
3. Issue supplements for any FAP benefits Claimant was entitled to receive but did not for November 1, 2011, ongoing; and
4. Notify Claimant in writing of its decision in accordance with Department policy.



**Alice C. Elkin**  
Administrative Law Judge  
For Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: January 24, 2012

Date Mailed: January 24, 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. (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 **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:

2012-19245/ACE

- 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

ACE/cl

cc:

