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

### IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 201259266 Issue No.: 2026;2014 Case No.:

Hearing Date: October 17, 2012

County: Kalamazoo County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Carmen G. Fahie

## **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 Wednesday, October 17, 2012 from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the claimant and his attorney, Richard Kupferschmidt, P# 27930, from Legal Aide of Western Michigan. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included Irma Andrade, ES and Assistant Attorney General, Attorney Katherine Montgomery, P# 75913.

# <u>ISSUE</u>

Due to excess income, did the Department properly ☐ deny the Claimant's application ☐ close Claimant's case ☒ reduce Claimant's benefits for:		
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)? ☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)? ☐ Medical Assistance (MA)?	<ul><li>☐ Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)?</li><li>☐ State Disability Assistance (SDA)?</li><li>☐ Child Development and Care (CDC)?</li></ul>	
FINDINGS OF FACT		
The Administrative Law Judge, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:		
<ol> <li>Claimant</li></ol>	<ul> <li>✓ received benefits for:</li> <li>☐ Adult Medical Assistance (AMP).</li> <li>☐ State Disability Assistance (SDA).</li> <li>☐ Child Development and Care (CDC).</li> </ul>	

2.	On May 22, 2012, the Department  denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's case  reduced Claimant's benefits due to excess income.	
3.	On May 22, 2012, the Department sent  Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)  notice of the denial. Closure. reduction.	
4.	On June 5, 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 ministered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq.	
Re 42 Ag 31	The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal esponsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence gency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1997 AACS R 400.3101-31. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective ctober 1, 1996.	
pro im Re Ag	The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) ogram] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is plemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal egulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence gency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1997 AACS R 0.3001-3015.	
Se Th	The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social ecurity 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 A program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MCL 400.105.	
for as	The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department (formerly known the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 0.10, et seq., and 1998-2000 AACS R 400.3151-400.3180.	
an 19	The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE d XX of the Social Security Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 90, 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 1997 AACS R 400.5001-5015. Additionally, the claimant was a recepient of Transitional MA (TMA) from June 1, 2011 through May 31, 2012 as a result of eligibility for TMA limited to only one year. (Department Exhibit 3.) The claimant was redetermined eligibility for MA beginning June 1, 2012. As a result of his excess income for MA, the claimant was determined eligible for a MA Spenddown/Deductible case. The claimant had unearned income from Social Security RSDI because of retirment of \$ ... (Department Exhibit 8-10.) After deductions of a \$ of adult's prorated income and a protected income of \$ of the state of the sta claimant had a deductible of \$ that he must meet before being eligible for MA. (Department Exhibit 14). However, the department incorrectly gave a deduction for child support paid, but it was in error. The child support was for arrears or past support of \$150, not a current child support obligation and therefore not deductible for MA. The department has met its burden that the claimant is eligible for MA with a deductible of \$154 that he must meet before being eligible for MA. After the hearing, the department caseworker will explain the MA deductible program again to the claimant. The department has met its burden that the claimant had excess income for MA. As a result of the child support change, the department will have to rerun a new budget and send out a new notice of case action. 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:  $\square$  AMP  $\square$  FIP  $\square$  FAP  $\boxtimes$  MA  $\square$  SDA  $\square$  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  $\square$  AFFIRMED  $\square$  REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record. Carmen G. Fahie Administrative Law Judge For Maura Corrigan, Director

Date Signed: October 19, 2012

Date Mailed: October 22, 2012

Department of Human Services

**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.

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.

Claimant may request a rehearing or reconsideration for the following reasons:

- A rehearing <u>MAY</u> be granted if there is newly discovered evidence that could affect the outcome
  of the original hearing decision.
- A reconsideration <u>MAY</u> 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

### CGF/hj

CC:

