

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2012 59989  
Issue No.: 2015  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: August 20, 2012  
County: Sanilac County DHS (00)

**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, an in person hearing was held on August 20, 2012, from Sandusky, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant's Authorized Hearing Representative, [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED], Assistance Payments Worker.

**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 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  received 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).  |

2. The Claimant applied for Medical Assistance and Retro Medical Assistance on 4/17/12 and 5/ 17/12, and sought retroactive benefits for March 2012.
3. As part of the 4/17/12 application, the Claimant's mother provided the Department a note indicating that the claimant and his girlfriend (mother of his children) all lived together in her home. (Exhibit 2a, pp.7)
4. On 4/17/12 , the Department  
 denied Claimant's application       closed Claimant's case  
due to the AMP program being closed; and that the Claimant was not a parent/caregiver of the children because they were included in other Medicaid cases. (Exhibit 10 a)
5. On 6/6/12 , the Department  
 denied Claimant's application 5/17/12 (retro) and approved the Medical Assistance application as of 5/1/12.       closed Claimant's case
6. The Department denied the Claimant's retro application because the Claimant was not disabled, blind, or a parent /caretaker relative of a dependent child or age. (Exhibit 10b)
7. On 6/6/12, the Department sent  
 Claimant       Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)  
notice of the       denial.       closure.
8. On 6/14/12, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the  
 denial of the 5/17/12 application (retro).       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, 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 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 AACS, 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 Claimant filed a second retroactive application for Medicaid when he reapplied for Medical Assistance after his April 2012 application was denied. The Claimant listed in the retro application as individuals living in the home: himself, his girlfriend and their two children (Exhibit 3C pp 35). The Department did not establish at the hearing that the Claimant was not a parent caretaker of the children listed in the application, and thus did not establish the basis for the denial of the retro application citing BEM 211 as the basis. The fact that the children may have been open in another case should not have been fatal per se. Unfortunately, the Department did not seek verification to clear up any discrepancies it believed to exist with respect to where the Claimant, his children and girlfriend lived and who was the caretaker(s) of his children. The Claimant's mother's note to the Department received with the first application clearly indicated that the Claimant and his children and their mother were all living together (Exhibit 2a). If the Department doubted that fact, it should have sought verification and should not have denied the retroactive application until it could determine the facts.

The Department belatedly determined, after it denied the 5/17/12 retro application, that the Claimant was working and receiving income at the time he filed both applications (Exhibit 2. pp66-67). This discrepancy and failure to report income no doubt colored the Department's presentation at the hearing, however cannot serve as a basis for its actions denying the May 2012 retro application.

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. The Department shall reinstate and reprocess the Claimant's retroactive application, dated 5/15/12, retro to the date of the application and shall determine Medical Assistance eligibility and coverage from the date of the application and any retro active months in accordance with Department policy.

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

Date Signed: August 30, 2012

Date Mailed: August 30, 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,
  - 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

LMF/hw

cc:

