

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2012 37371
Issue No.: 3002, 2001
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: March 29, 2012
County: Wayne County DHS (31)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Lynn M. Ferris

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 March 29, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED], ES.

ISSUE

Due to excess income, did the Department properly deny the Claimant's application close Claimant's case reduce Claimant's 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)? |

Did the Department properly deny the Claimant's application for Medical Assistance.

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 for: 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 April 1, 2012, the Department denied Claimant's application for Medical Assistance
 closed Claimant's case reduced Claimant's benefits for Food Assistance due to excess income.
3. The Claimant was receiving \$548 biweekly in unemployment compensation benefits. Exhibit 3.
4. The Claimant, at the time of her application for Medical Assistance was not disabled, a adult/caretaker of a minor child , was over 21, years of age and the Adult Medical Program was closed. Exhibit 1 and 5.
5. The Claimant did not indicate on her application that she was disabled and unable to work. Exhibit 1.
6. On February 23, 2012, the Department sent
 Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)
notice of the denial of the Medical Assistance application closure.
reduction of Claimant's Food Assistance.
7. On March 29, 2012, Claimant or Claimant's AHR filed a hearing request, protesting the
 denial of the application. For Medical Assistance. closure of the case.
reduction of Food Assistance benefits.

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 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 AACCS, Rule 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, Rule 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.

Additionally, at the hearing the Claimant confirmed that she receives \$548 gross biweekly in unemployment compensation benefits. The Department presented FAP budgets that were reviewed at the hearing. The Department correctly used the unemployment compensation and determined that the Claimant's gross unearned income per month was \$1178 (Exhibit 2), and also credited the Claimant with housing expense of \$165.68 per month based on taxes of \$1988.20. Exhibit 4. Based upon the documentary evidence presented (FAP Budgets), and the testimony of the parties, the Department correctly reduced the Claimant's FAP benefits due to the unemployment income being counted.

The Claimant's application for Medical Assistance dated February 23, 2012 was also reviewed during the hearing. A review of the application indicates that the Claimant answered "none" to question 10 of the application, asking whether she or anyone in her household was physically or mentally unable to work full time. Exhibit 1. Based upon the answers provided by the Claimant in her application for Medical Assistance, the Department determined that she was not eligible for Medical Assistance as she was not blind, disabled, a parent/caretaker of a minor child and over 21 . BEM 220. In addition, the Department determined that the Claimant was not eligible for the Adult Medical Program as the program was closed to new enrollment. Thus, based upon the evidence presented by the Department, it is determined that the Department properly denied the Claimant's application for Medical Assistance.

As stated at the hearing, the Claimant may reapply for Medical Assistance at any time if she wishes to do so on the basis that she is disabled.

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 income, the Department properly improperly

- denied Claimant's February 23, 2012 application for Medical Assistance.
- reduced Claimant's benefits for Food Assistance
- 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:



Lynn M. Ferris
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: April 3, 2012

Date Mailed: April 3, 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:
 - misapplication of manual policy or law in the hearing decision,

201237371/LMF

- 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 to:

Michigan Administrative hearings
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request
P. O. Box 30639
Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

LMF/hw

cc:

