

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No: 2012-54439  
Issue No: 2021

[REDACTED]

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Landis Y. Lain

**HEARING DECISION**

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on [REDACTED]. Claimant died [REDACTED]. Claimant was represented at the hearing by [REDACTED]. Claimant's spouse appeared and testified on her behalf.

**ISSUE**

Did the department of Human Services (the department) properly deny claimant's application for Medical Assistance (MA) based upon its determination that claimant had excess assets?

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the competent, material and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. On [REDACTED], claimant filed an application for Medical Assistance and retroactive Medical Assistance benefits.
2. The application was processed and claimant was found to have excess assets.
3. On [REDACTED], the department caseworker sent claimant notice that his application was denied because he retained excess assets.
4. On [REDACTED] claimant's representative filed a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.

**CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

The regulations governing the hearing and appeal process for applicants and recipients of public assistance in Michigan are found in the Michigan Administrative Code, MAC R

400.901-400.951. An opportunity for a hearing shall be granted to an applicant who requests a hearing because his or her claim for assistance has been denied. MAC R 400.903(1). Clients have the right to contest a department decision affecting eligibility or benefit levels whenever it is believed that the decision is incorrect. The department will provide an administrative hearing to review the decision and determine the appropriateness of that decision. BAM 600.

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by 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 (DHS or department) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105. Department policies are found in the Program Administrative Manual (BAM), the Program Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

Title XIX of the Social Security Act, commonly referred to as “The Medicaid Act,” provides for medical assistance services to individuals **who lack the financial means to obtain needed health care**. 42 U.S.C. §1396. (Emphasis added)

The Medicaid program is administered by the federal government through the Centers for Medicaid and Medicare Services (CMS) of the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). The state and federal governments share financial responsibility for Medicaid services. Each state may choose whether or not to participate in the Medicaid program. Once a state chooses to participate, it must operate its Medicaid program in accordance with mandatory federal requirements, imposed both by the Medicaid Act and by implementing federal regulations authorized under the Medicaid Act and promulgated by HHS.

Participating states must provide at least seven categories of medical services to persons determined to be eligible Medicaid recipients. 42 USC §1396a(a)(10)(A), 1396d(a)(1)-(5), (17), (21). One of the seven mandated services is *nursing facility services*. 42 USC §1396d(a)(4)(A).

For medical assistance eligibility, the Department has defined an asset as “any kind of property or property interest, whether real, personal, or mixed, whether liquid or illiquid, and whether or not presently vested with possessory rights.” NDAC 75-02-02.1-01(3). Under both federal and state law, an asset must be “actually available” to an applicant to be considered a countable asset for determining medical assistance eligibility. [Hecker, 527 N.W.2d at 237 \(On Petition for Rehearing\); Hinschberger v. Griggs County Social Serv., 499 N.W.2d 876, 882 \(N.D.1993\); 42 U.S.C. § 1396a\(a\)\(17\)\(B\); 1 J. Krauskopf, R. Brown, K. Tokarz, and A. Bogutz, Elderlaw: Advocacy for the Aging § 11.25 \(2d ed. 1993\). Yet, “actually available” resources “are different from those in hand.” Schweiker v. Gray Panthers, 453 U.S. 34, 48, 101 S.Ct. 2633, 2642, 69 L.Ed.2d 460 \(1981\)](#) (emphasis in original). NDAC 75-02-02.1-25(2) explains: Only such assets as are actually available will be considered. Assets are actually available when at the disposal of an applicant, recipient, or responsible relative; when the applicant, recipient, or responsible relative has a legal interest in a liquidated sum and has the legal ability to

make the sum available for support, maintenance, or medical care; or when the applicant, recipient, or responsible relative has the lawful power to make the asset available, or to cause the asset to be made available. Assets will be reasonably evaluated.... See also [45 C.F.R. § 233.20\(a\)\(3\)\(ii\)\(D\)](#).

As noted in *Hecker*, if an applicant has a legal ability to obtain an asset, it is considered an “actually available” resource. The actual-availability principle primarily serves “to prevent the States from conjuring fictional sources of income and resources by imputing financial support from persons who have no obligation to furnish it or by overvaluing assets in a manner that attributes non-existent resources to recipients.” [Heckler v. Turner, 470 U.S. 184, 200, 105 S.Ct. 1138, 1147, 84 L.Ed.2d 138 \(1985\)](#).

The focus is on an applicant's actual and practical ability to make an asset available as a matter of fact, not legal fiction. See [Schrader v. Idaho Dept. of Health and Welfare, 768 F.2d 1107, 1112 \(9th Cir.1985\)](#). See also [Lewis v. Martin, 397 U.S. 552, 90 S.Ct. 1282, 25 L.Ed.2d 561 \(1970\)](#) (invalidating California state regulation that presumed contribution of non-AFDC resources by a non-legally responsible and non-adoptive stepfather or common law husband of an AFDC recipient's mother).

Determining whether an asset is “actually available” for purposes of medical assistance eligibility is largely a fact-specific inquiry depending on the circumstances of each case. See, e.g., [Intermountain Health Care v. Bd. of Cty. Com'rs, 107 Idaho 248, 688 P.2d 260, 264 \(Ct.App.1984\)](#); [Radano v. Blum, 89 A.D.2d 858, 453 N.Y.S.2d 38, 39 \(1982\)](#); [Haynes v. Dept. of Human Resources, 121 N.C.App. 513, 470 S.E.2d 56, 58 \(1996\)](#). Interpretation of the “actually available” requirement must be “reasonable and humane in accordance with its manifest intent and purpose....” [Moffett v. Blum, 74 A.D.2d 625, 424 N.Y.S.2d 923, 925 \(1980\)](#). That an applicant must sue to collect an asset the applicant has a legal entitlement to usually does not mean the asset is actually unavailable. See, e.g., [Wagner v. Sheridan County S.S. Bd., 518 N.W.2d 724, 728 \(N.D.1994\)](#); [Frerks v. Shalala, 52 F.3d 412, 414 \(2d Cir.1995\)](#); [Probate of Marcus, 199 Conn. 524, 509 A.2d 1, 5 \(1986\)](#); [Herman v. Ramsey Cty. Community Human Serv., 373 N.W.2d 345, 348 \(Minn.Ct.App.1985\)](#). See also [Ziegler v. Dept. of Health & Rehab. Serv., 601 So.2d 1280, 1284 \(Fla.Ct.App.1992\)](#) At issue here is the methodology utilized in determining the availability of an individual's “resources” for purposes of evaluating his or her eligibility. SSI recipients, and thus SSI-related “medically needy” recipients, may not retain resources having a value in excess of \$2,000. [42 U.S.C. § 1382\(a\)\(1\)\(B\)](#).

The regulations governing the determination of eligibility provide that resources mean cash or other liquid assets or any real or personal property that an individual (or spouse, if any) owns and could convert to cash to be used for his support and maintenance. If the individual has the right, authority or power to liquidate the property, or his share of the property, it is considered a resource. If a property right cannot be liquidated, the property will not be considered a resource of the individual (or spouse). [20 C.F.R. § 416.1201\(a\)](#).

Assets must be considered in determining eligibility or SSI related categories. Assets mean cash, any other personal property and real property. (BEM, Item 400 Page 1). Countable assets cannot exceed the applicable asset limit. Not all assets are counted. Some assets are counted for one program but not for another program. (BEM Item 400, Page 1). The department is to consider both of the following to determine whether and how much of an asset is countable: An asset is countable if it meets the availability test and is not excluded. The department is to consider the assets of each person in the asset group. (BEM, Item 400, Page 1). Asset eligibility exists when the asset groups countable assets are less than or equal to the applicable asset limit at least one day during the month being tested. (BEM, Item 400, Page 4). An application does not authorize MA for future months if the person has excess assets on the processing date. The SSI related MA asset limit for SSI related MA categories that are not medicare savings program or QDWI is \$2000.00 for an asset group for one person and \$3000.00 for an asset group of 2 people. BEM, Item 400 Page 5. An asset must be available to be counted. Available means that someone in the asset group has the legal right to use or dispose of the asset. BEM, Item 400, Page 6. The department is to assume an asset is available unless the evidence shows that it is not available.

Exclude one motorized vehicle owned by the asset group. If the asset group owns multiple motorized vehicles:

Use the [Employment Asset Exclusions](#) first, then  
From any remaining motorized vehicles, exclude the one with the highest equity value. BEM 400, page 28.

In this case, the department received a certificate of title for a [REDACTED], a [REDACTED], lien release and a title for a [REDACTED], as well as bank statements for [REDACTED]. Claimant's husband testified that he bought the [REDACTED] and he traded in the [REDACTED]. He sold the other car to his son for \$1.00 [REDACTED]. Thus, he owned two vehicles until at least [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] had an average trade-in value of \$1740.00 and the [REDACTED] had an average trade-in value of \$2,125.00. Department policy allows the department to exclude one vehicle from asset determination. In addition, claimant has a primary share savings account which showed a continuous balance of \$3000.00 for all relevant months, as well as a checking account which shows an income deposit and constant activity. (Exhibit #44)

In the instant case, the department has established by the necessary competent, material and of substantial evidence on the record that it was acting in compliance with department policy when it determined that claimant and her spouse had in excess of \$3000.00 in countable available assets because the cash value of claimant's assets (one vehicle and the primary savings account) resulted in more than \$3000 in countable available assets for claimant. The department's case must be upheld.

**DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the claimant has in excess of \$3000.00 in countable available assets for purpose of medical assistance benefit eligibility. The department properly denied claimants' application for Medical Assistance under the circumstances in determining that claimant had excess countable available assets.

Accordingly, the department's decision is **AFFIRMED**.

/s/  
Landis Y. Lain  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: [REDACTED]

Date Mailed: [REDACTED]

**NOTICE:** Administrative Hearings 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. Administrative Hearings 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 mailing 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.

LYL/jk

cc: [REDACTED]  
MAHS