

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**



Reg. No.: 20124854  
Issue No.: 3019  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: November 21, 2011  
County: Wayne County (19)

**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 November 21, 2011, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant, [REDACTED], and the Claimant's witness [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED], Assistance Payment Supervisor.

**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)?  |

Due to failure to meet the deductible for three months, 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 type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP)?      | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA)? |
| <input checked="" 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA).	<input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC).
  
2. On May 1, 2011, the Department  denied Claimant's application  
 closed Claimant's case  reduced Claimant's benefits  
due to the Claimant's failure to meet the monthly MA deductible.
  
3. On October 1, 2011, the Department  denied Claimant's application  
 closed Claimant's case  reduced Claimant's benefits.
  
4. On April 1, 2011, the Department sent  
 Claimant  Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)  
notice of the  denial.  closure.  reduction.
  
5. On September 1, 2011, the Department sent  
 Claimant  Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)  
notice of the  denial.  closure.  reduction.
  
6. On September 27, 2011, Claimant or Claimant's AHR filed a hearing request,  
protesting the  
 denial of the application.  closure of the case.  reduction of 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, with respect to the reduction of the Claimant's FAP benefits, the Department had insufficient evidence to justify the reduction in FAP benefits. The testimony on the record was inconsistent with the statements set forth in the Department's hearing summary. To that end, the Department has failed to establish that it acted in accordance with Department policy when it reduced the Claimant's FAP benefits.

With respect to the closure of the Claimant's MA benefits for her failure to meet the deductible for three months, there was no dispute that the deductible had not been met for that period of time. There was further no dispute as to the Claimant's income that was considered in determining the amount of the spend-down in this matter. The Claimant did dispute the fact that she had to meet a spend-down for MA coverage to be active, however, based on the Claimant's monthly unearned income, a spend-down has been applied according to Department policy in this case.

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 closed the Claimant's MA case  improperly reduced the Claimant's FAP benefits.

### **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 when it closed the Claimant's MA coverage


did not act properly when it reduced the Claimant's FAP benefits.

Accordingly, the Department's  AMP  FIP  FAP  MA  SDA  CDC decision is  AFFIRMED  REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.

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. The Department shall remove the negative action dated October 1, 2011 related to the reduction of the Claimant's FAP benefits.
2. The Department shall recalculate the Claimant's FAP benefits in accordance with Department policy.
3. The Department shall supplement the Claimant for any lost FAP benefits he was eligible and otherwise qualified to receive but-for the negative case action in accordance with Department policy.

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

Date Signed: 12/15/11

Date Mailed: 12/15/11

**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. (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,
  - typographical errors, mathematical error, or other obvious errors in the hearing decision that effect the substantial rights of the claimant:

2012-4854/AJB

- 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:

