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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.:	2013 45087
Issue No.:	3003
Case No.:	
Hearing Date:	May 30, 2013
County:	Oakland (03)

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, telephone hearing was held on May 30, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included

ISSUE

Due to excess income, did the Department properly \Box deny the Claimant's application \boxtimes close Claimant's case \Box reduce Claimant's benefits for:

Family Independence Program (FIP)?

Food Assistance Program (FAP)?

Medical Assistance (MA)?

Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)?

- State Disability Assistance (SDA)?
- 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 \Box applied for benefits for: \boxtimes received benefits for:
 - Family Independence Program (FIP).

Food Assistance Program (FAP).

] Medical Assistance (MA).

Adult Medical Assistance (AMP).

State Disability Assistance (SDA).

Child Development and Care (CDC).

- On April 1, 2013, the Department denied Claimant's application
 Closed Claimant's case reduced Claimant's benefits due to excess income.
- On March 29, 2013, the Department sent
 □ Claimant
 □ Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)
 □ otice of the
 □ denial.
 □ closure.
 □ reduction.
- 4. On May 1, 2013, 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, in this case the Claimant's Food Assistance case was closed due to her income exceeding the income limit for a group of 3. The Department correctly based the Claimant's FAP calculations on 3 check stubs provided by the Claimant to the Department pursuant to a redetermination. Exhibit 1. The Claimant's gross earnings paid biweekly were \$1583.34 and were correctly multiplied by 2.15 to yield \$3404 in net earned income. The Claimant was given the maximum shelter deduction of \$469, an earned income credit of \$681(\$3404 X .20= \$681) and a standard deduction from income of \$148 established by RFT 255. Exhibit 2. The Claimant confirmed that her FAP group consisted of 3 members, and thus based upon a correctly calculated net income of \$2106 the Claimant's income exceeded the income limit established by RFT 260 of \$1591. BEM 505 and 554.

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

denied Claimant's application

reduced Claimant's benefits

 \boxtimes 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 \square did act properly \square did not act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's \square AMP \square FIP \boxtimes FAP \square MA \square SDA \square CDC decision is \boxtimes AFFIRMED \square REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.

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

Date Signed: June 4, 2013

Date Mailed: June 4, 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 <u>MAY</u> 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 affect the substantial rights of the claimant:
 - 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

2013-45087/LMF

LMF/cl

