

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**



Reg. No.: 201310058  
Issue No.: 2018; 2026  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: April 18, 2013  
County: Oakland (03)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Alice C. Elkin

**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 April 18, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED], Family Independence Manager.

**ISSUE**

Did the Department properly provide Claimant Medical Assistance (MA) coverage with a \$463 monthly deductible?

**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 was an ongoing recipient of MA.
2. On October 23, 2012, the Department sent Claimant a Notice of Case Action, notifying him that his MA deductible was decreased to \$463 effective December 1, 2012.
3. On October 29, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, disputing the Department's action.

## **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

Department policies are contained in the Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and Department of Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

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.

Additionally, Claimant requested a hearing to dispute the Department's calculation of his \$463 monthly MA deductible.

Individuals are eligible for Group 2 MA coverage when net income (countable income minus allowable income deductions) does not exceed the applicable Group 2 MA protected income levels (PIL), which is based on shelter area and fiscal group size. BEM 105, p 1; BEM 166 (October 1, 2010), pp 1-2; BEM 544 (August 1, 2008), p 1; RFT 240 (July 1, 2007), p 1. The monthly PIL for an MA group of one (Claimant) living in Oakland County is \$408 per month. RFT 200 (July 1, 2007), p 1; RFT 240, p 1. Thus, if Claimant's net monthly income is in excess of the \$408, he may become eligible for assistance under the deductible program, with the deductible being equal to the amount that his monthly income exceeds \$408. BEM 545 (July 1, 2011), p 1.

In this case, the Department produced a SSI-Related MA budget showing how the deductible in Claimant's case was calculated. Claimant verified that, at the time the Notice of Case Action was sent to him, he received gross monthly Retirement, Survivors, and Disability Insurance (RSDI) benefits of \$991. The Department properly subtracted the \$20 disregard to establish Claimant's total net income for MA purposes at \$971. BEM 530 (October 1, 2012), p 1; BEM 541 (January 1, 2011), p 3. The Department subtracted Claimant's \$99.90 Part B Medicare premium to determine his countable income of \$871. See BEM 544 (August 1, 2008), p 1. Claimant had not presented the Department with any other medical expenses he incurred that qualified as need items under policy. See BEM 541; BEM 544.

Because Claimant's net income of \$871 for MA purposes exceeds the monthly protected income level of \$408 by \$463, the Department calculated Claimant's monthly \$463 MA deductible in accordance with Department policy.

## **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 acted in accordance with Department policy when it calculated Claimant's monthly MA deductible.

Accordingly, the Department's decision is AFFIRMED.



**Alice C. Elkin**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 4/24/2013

Date Mailed: 4/24/2013

**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.
- 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

ACE/hw

cc:

