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

IAI	THE	RAAT	TED	OF.
117	ınr	IVIAI	IFR	UT:

	Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	2013-16433 4013 May 1, 2013 Wayne (19)				
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Jan Levente	er					
HEARING DECISION						
his 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 dephone hearing was held on May 1, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on ehalf of Claimant included the Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of uman Services (Department) included Assistance Payments forker, and Family Independence Manager.						
On May 21, 2013, the case was reassigned to for preparation of a decision and order.	lay 21, 2013, the case was reassigned to Administrative Law Judge Jan Leventer eparation of a decision and order.					
<u>ISSUE</u>						
Due to excess income, did the Department pro ☐ close Claimant's case ☐ reduce Claimant's		laimant's application				
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 O	F FACT					
The Administrative Law Judge, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:						
1. Claimant ⊠ applied for benefits for: □	received benefits fo	r:				
<ul><li>Family Independence Program (FIP).</li><li>Food Assistance Program (FAP).</li><li>Medical Assistance (MA).</li></ul>		ssistance (AMP). Assistance (SDA). ent and Care (CDC).				

2.	On November 21, 2012, the Department  denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's case reduced Claimant's benefits due to excess income.							
3.	On November 21, 2012, the Department sent  Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)  notice of the denial. closure. reduction.							
4.	On November 30, 2012, Claimant or Claimant's AHR filed a hearing request, protesting the $\square$ denial of the application. $\square$ closure of the case. $\square$ reduction of benefits.							
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW							
	partment policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the dges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).							
☑ The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, <i>et seq.</i> , and 2000 AACS, Rule 400.3151 through Rule 400.3180.								
Additionally, the Department's Reference Table 225, "SDA Monthly Assistance Payment Standards Table," contains a chart titled "Effective for All Applications On or After 10/1/2011." The chart indicates that for an individual who is living independently, they do not qualify for SDA if their income is more than \$200 per month. Department of Human Services Reference Tables (RFT) 225 (2011).								
In this case Claimant's monthly income is \$756, which is clearly more than \$200. Accordingly, the Department acted correctly in denying SDA benefits to Claimant, and the Department shall be affirmed.								
his	so at the hearing the Claimant indicated that he sought FAP and MA assistance for son. As Claimant presented no proof that he had physical custody of his son, these ues cannot be addressed in this decision.							
sta	sed upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons ited on the record, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that, due to excess some, the Department $\square$ properly $\square$ improperly							
	<ul> <li>☑ denied Claimant's application</li> <li>☐ reduced Claimant's benefits</li> <li>☐ closed Claimant's case</li> </ul>							
for	: ☐ AMP ☐ FIP ☐ FAP ☐ MA ☒ SDA ☐ CDC.							

## **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions

 asons stated on the rec	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Department
artment's		SDA CDC decision ecord.

Jan Leventer
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: June 10, 2013

Date Mailed: June 10, 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

## 2013-16433/JL

## JL/cl

CC: