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

IN THE MATTER OF:	Dog No:	2013-15096	
	Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	3003 January 15, 2013 Wayne-49 County DHS	
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Corey A. Arendt			
HEARING DECISION			
This matter is before the undersigned Admini strative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 following Claim ant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on J anuary 15, 2013 from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included			
<u>ISSUE</u>			
Due to excess income, did the Department properly ☐ deny the Claimant's applic ation ☐ close Claimant's case ☒ reduce Claimant's benefits for:			
Food Assistance Program (FAP)?	Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)? State Disability Assistance (SDA)? Child Development and Care (CDC)?		
FINDINGS OF FACT			
The Administrative Law Judge, based on t he competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:			
1. Cla imant ☐ applied for benefits for: ☐ received benefits for:			
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP). ☐ Adult Medical Assistance (AMP). ☐ State Disability Assistance (SDA).			

2. On December 1, 2012, the Department ☐ denied Claimant's application ☐ closed Claimant's case ☐ reduced Claimant's benefits

Child Development and Care (CDC).

due to excess income.

Medical Assistance (MA).

3. On October 22, 2012, the Department sent ☐ Claimant ☐ Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the ☐ denial. ☐ closure. ☐ reduction.		
 On November 30, 2012, Claimant or Claimant's A HR filed a hearing r equest, protesting the ☐ denial of the application. ☐ closure of the case. ☐ reduction of benefits. 		
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW		
Department policies are contained in the Br idges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).		
The FAP [formerly known as the Food Stamp (F S) program] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in T itle 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, R 400.3001 through Rule 400.3015.		
After an extensive review of the Claimant's budget I have determined all calculations were properly made at review, and all FAP issuance/budgeting rules were properly applied. As such, the Department's reduction of the Claimant's FAP benefits must be upheld.		
Based upon the abov e Findings of Fact and Conclus ions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, I find, the Department properly reduced Claimant's FAP benefits.		
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		
Accordingly, the Department's FAP decision is AFFIRMED for the reasons stated on the record.		
/s/		
Corey A. Arendt Administrative Law Judge For Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services		
Date Signed: January 16, 2013		

Date Mailed: January 16, 2013

NOTICE: Michigan Administrative Hearing S ystem (MAHS) may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a par ty within 30 days of the mailing date of this Dec ision and Order. MAHS will not or der a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's mo tion where the final decis ion 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 ti mely 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 effect the substantial rights of the claimant:
- the failure of the ALJ to address ot decision.

Request must be submitted through the local DHS office or directly to MAHS by mail at Michigan Administrative hearings

Recons ideration/Rehearing Request

P. O. Box 30639

Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

CAA/las



