

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2012-49858  
Issue No.: 3002  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: May 31, 2012  
County: Wayne (82-17)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Jan Leventer

**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 May 31, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant and her husband, [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED].

**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)?  |

**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  closed Claimant's case  reduced Claimant's benefits due to excess income.
3. On April 30, 2012, the Department sent  Claimant  Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the  denial.  closure.  reduction.
4. On April 25, 2012, 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 AAC, 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, the facts in this case are that Claimant was a FAP recipient and was asked to complete a Redetermination application dated March 1, 2012. On the Redetermination, Claimant stated that her husband's income was \$500/month.

However, the Department received wage records from the employer indicating income of \$500 for December 2011 and \$625 for January 2012. Claimant's husband testified that he received more income in January 2012 because there were five weeks in January.

At the hearing, the Department witness testified that the wage records from the husband's employer were not clear because they contained payroll information about other employees as well as Claimant's husband. Having reviewed the payroll records, it is found and determined that they clearly state Claimant's husband's monthly income for two months, and the names of the other employees have been blacked out. The payroll records are the best records available as to Claimant's husband's gross income, and they are accepted as the most reliable evidence in this case.

Also, Claimant's husband presented his 2011 W-2 IRS Form at the hearing. The W-2 Form states that his gross income for 2011 was \$6,500. It is found and determined that this amount is consistent with the income amount presented in the payroll records and the testimony in this case.

The Department also presented a DHS Form, "Verification of Employment," which is unsigned, and which indicates that Claimant is paid on a weekly basis. However, the form does not say how much he is paid each week. He works 4 hours a day, five days a week, at \$8.00/hr., so his weekly wage is \$160. This amount is consistent with a gross monthly income of \$500, allowing for fluctuations from month to month. It is found and determined that weekly payment of \$160 minus deductions, is consistent with a monthly income of \$500/month.

It is found and determined that the Department erred in reducing Claimant's FAP benefits from \$584 to \$185 per month, and Claimant shall be restored to the benefit level to which she is entitled.

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 application
- reduced Claimant's benefits
- 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. Initiate procedures to reinstate Claimant's FAP benefits to the level to which she is entitled;
2. Initiate procedures to provide retroactive and ongoing FAP benefits to Claimant at the level to which she is entitled.
3. All steps shall be taken in accordance with Department policy and procedure.



**Jan Leventer**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: June 4, 2012

Date Mailed: June 4, 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:

2012-49858/JL

- 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

JL/pf

cc:

