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

IN THE MATTER OF:

Reg. No.: 2013 15000

Issue No.:

Case No.:
Hearing Date: April 29, 2013

County: Wayne County DHS (17)

2021

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, a telephone hearing was held on April 29, 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 assets, did the Department properly \(\sqrt{2} \) deny the Claimant's application

close Claimant's case for:				
Family Independence Program (FIP)? Medical Assistance (MA)? Food Assistance Program (FAP)?	☐ Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)? ☐ State Disability Assistance (SDA)?			
FINDINGS OF FACT				
The Administrative Law Judge, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, including the testimony at the hearing, finds as material fact:				
 Claimant				
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP). ☐ Medical Assistance (MA). ☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)	Adult Medical Assistance (AMP). State Disability Assistance (SDA).			
	Family Independence Program (FIP)? Medical Assistance (MA)? Food Assistance Program (FAP)? FINDINGS Of the Administrative Law Judge, based on the idence on the whole record, including the text: Claimant applied for benefits receive Family Independence Program (FIP). Medical Assistance (MA).			

3. On November 20, 2012, the Department sent

2. Due to excess assets, on 7/1/12, the Department

denied Claimant's application. Closed Claimant's case.

☐ Claimant ☐ Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)notice of the ☐ denial. ☐ closure.
 On November 15, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the 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 (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MCL 400.105.
Additionally, in this case the evidence presented demonstrated that the Claimant had a savings account in her name which contained \$3,000 on the date she applied. Even though the account was set up for her disabled son, the account was soley in the Claimant's name and thus the Department correctly considered that the Claimant had a savings account asset in the amount of \$3,000. At the hearing the Claimant confirmed that the amount of funds in the savings account was \$3,000 and that she also had a checking account. The Claimant's case was denied because the Department determined that Claimant had more than \$3,000 in assets when she applied for medical assistance as a group 2 caretaker. Based upon the asset limit established by BEM 400 an applicant for medical assistance assets cannot exceed \$3,000. BEM 400 pp4 (7/1/12). In this case the Department established that the Claimant's assets exceeded \$3,000 at application. The Claimant's chief argument was that the \$3,000 savings account was established solely for the use of her son, however the account was in Claimant's name only and thus was properly attributed to Claimant as her asset.
Therfore, it is concluded that the Department properly denied the Claimant's application for medical assistance. The Claimant may reapply for Medical Assistance at any time, subject to the asset limit.
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 assets, 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.

DECISION AND ORDER

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 decision is AFFIRMED REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.
Ja M. Senis
Lynn M. Ferris
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: May 21, 2013
Date Mailed: May 21, 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
LMF/tm

