

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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2012-78464
Issue No.: 3002
Case No.:
Hearing Date: January 10, 2013
County: Wayne (49)

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 hearing was held on January 10, 2013, at Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant and her husband, . Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included , Assistance Payments Worker and , Family Independence Manager.

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 October 1, 2012, the Department denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's case reduced Claimant's benefits due to excess income.
3. On September 8, 2012, the Department sent Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the denial. closure. reduction.
4. On September 13, 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 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.

Additionally, the issue at the hearing was whether Claimant received correct expense deductions for heat/utility, housing and medical expenses. During the hearing the Department explained that the heat/utility expense deduction of \$575 was the maximum deduction allowed by law, regardless whether the customer's expenses were greater than \$575. Department of Human Services Reference Tables (RFT) 255 (2012), Chart 2, "Shelter Deductions," line 2, "Heat and utility." The Claimant testified that she understood the explanation and was satisfied with it.

Second, the Department explained that the housing cost deduction of \$57.01 was based on Claimant's 2011 property tax bill of \$684, which was apportioned over a twelve-month period. After the Department's explanation, Claimant testified that she understood the explanation and was satisfied with it. Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 554 (2012), pp. 3, 10.

Third, with regard to the medical expense deduction of \$65, the Department testified that Claimant's medical expenses in June, 2012, were \$3,518, and decreased to \$0 in July, 2012. The Department witness explained that this caused her medical expense deduction to decrease. The Department then determined that because Claimant's medical deduction decreased, Claimant had more income available for purchasing food. Accordingly, the Department decreased Claimant's food allotment from \$526 to \$188. *Id.*, pp. 5-7. After the Department explained the process to Claimant, she indicated

that she understood and was satisfied that the Department acted in accordance with policy.

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.



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

Date Signed: January 11, 2013

Date Mailed: January 11, 2013

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.

2012-78464/JL

- 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

JL/tm

cc:

